# DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

*Let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the doctrine of the priesthood shall distil upon thy soul as the dews from heaven. (D & C 121:45)*

JANUARY 1991 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH VOL. 8 NO. 1


## NEW LIGHT ON THE ANCIENT HEBREW/CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ON DEITY

Part 1


Collier's Publishing Co.

Copyright © 1991
by
Fred C. Collier
All Rights Reserved.

Copies may be obtained
by writing:

Collier's Publishing Co.
HC 63 Box 1B
Hanna, Utah 84031

Phone:
(505) 600-1842
Sales:
(801) 882-4754

Email:
ColliersPublishingCo@gmail.com

http://ColliersPublishing.org

# Dedication

I dedicate this work to *the knowledge* of God the Father — to the vindication of His Prophets Joseph Smith and Brigham Young — and to Walter Martin, with love!

# INTRODUCTION

No one who is converted to the teachings of Jesus will deny the importance of the Father and the knowledge of God. As Jesus himself expressed it:

And this is *life eternal,* ***that they might know thee*** *the only true God,* and *Jesus Christ*, whom thou hast sent. (John 17:3)

To be certain, it is clear from Jesus' own sayings that no man can obtain *Eternal Life* without the knowledge of God. And yet, notwithstanding this, according to Jesus, the knowledge and identity of God the Father was a well kept secret which only he could reveal. Again, as Jesus expressed himself:

*no man knoweth . . .* ***who the Father is****, but the Son, and he to whom* ***the Son*** *will reveal Him.* (Luke 10:22; Matt. 11:27)

The identity of God the Father remained a well kept secret throughout the ministry of Jesus, and continued as such with his worthy disciples, who ultimately took it with them to the grave. Thus the secret doctrine of the Father was taken from the Earth and lost to the world for nearly 2000 years — until the nineteenth century, when, through "the restoration of all things", it was again revealed from Heaven to the Prophet Joseph Smith.

Commencing early in the Nauvoo period, the Prophet began to lay the essential foundation, in order to prepare the minds of the Saints for the revelation of the whole doctrine on God. These efforts culminated at the General Conference of the Church, which was held less than three months before the Prophet's death, on April 7th, 1844, when he delivered his now famous "King Follett Sermon". "What kind of a being was God in the beginning, before the world was", the Prophet asked. And then in responding to his own question, he stated:

I will tell you, [so] open your ears and eyes and hear it all ye ends of the Earth, and I am going to prove it to you with the Bible. . . .

First [of all], ***God Himself,*** *who sits enthroned in yonder Heavens* ***is a man*** *like unto one of yourselves*. That is the great secret. If the veil was rent today and the ***Great God*** who holds this world in its sphere or its orbit and {who} upholds the planets {and} all things by His power — if you were to see Him today, you would see Him *in all the person [and] very image* ***like a man,*** *in fashion and in form — [just] like yourselves . . . . . .*

It is the ***First Principle of the Gospel*** *to know for a certainty the Character of God*, {and} to know that we may converse with Him [just the] same as one man {converses} with another — and *that He once was a man like us* — {Yea that} ***God Himself, the Father of us all****, was once as one of us, and* ***dwelt on an earth like us****.* The Father once [lived] on a planet with [a body of] flesh and blood, [the] same as Jesus himself did, [when he came on Earth] in the flesh — and I will show it from the Bible. (The King Follet Discourse Give by the Prophet Joseph Smith — A New Amalgamated Text, edited by Fred C. Collier, to be published in a future issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood.*)

Due to an untimely death, the Prophet never lived to proclaim the identity of God — he had revealed to the world that God was an exalted man with a body of flesh and bone, and that He was indeed our Father, but he never lived to proclaim who that Father was. Thus the knowledge of God remained a secret until the administration of President Brigham Young, who had received private instruction from the Prophet, and revelation for himself on the matter.

It was not until April 9th, 1852, at the General Priesthood Conference of the Church, that President Young was finally lead to reveal to the world the identity of God the Father: "One thing has remained a mystery in this kingdom up to this day," he said:

It is in regard to the character of the well beloved Son of God, upon which subject the Elders of Israel have conflicting views. Our God and Father in heaven, is a being of tabernacle, or in other words, He has a body, with parts the same as you and I have. . . . His son Jesus Christ has become a personage of tabernacle, and has a body like his father. . . . The question has been, and is

often, asked, who it is that begat the Son of the Virgin Mary. The infidel world have concluded that if what the Apostles wrote about his father and mother be true, and the present marriage discipline acknowledged by Christendom be correct, then Christians must believe that God is the father of an illegitimate son, in the person of Jesus Christ! The infidel fraternity teach *that* to their disciples. I will tell you how it is.

. . . .

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a *celestial body*, and brought Eve, *one of his wives,* with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, *the Archangel,* the ANCIENT OF DAYS! About whom holy men have written and spoken — HE *is our* FATHER *and our* GOD, *and the only God with whom* WE *have to do*. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or non-professing, must hear it, and *will know it sooner or later.* . . . When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit, their bodies became mortal from *its effects,* and therefore their offspring were mortal. When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family. . . . . Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven. Now, let all who may hear these doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation. (*Journal of Discourses* vol. 1 <9 April 1852> 50–51, emphasis in original; see also *The Teachings of President Brigham Young Vol. 3 1852–1854* <1987> 91–94)

To say the least, President Young's revelation of the Secret Doctrine sent shock waves through the Church. Not only so, but it also served to widen the gulf between the restored Church and "orthodox" Christianity. Indeed, the prejudice was so great that traditional Christianity rehected Mormonism as unchristian. Putting all symantics aside, from their perspective, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints does not worship the God of the Bible — nor of that matter does it worship the Jesus of the Bible. Consequently, in their estimation, Mormonism is not to be defined as a Christian religion.

This then becomes the focus of this issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood* — Does the Bible substantiate the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith and President Young? In answering this question, not only will we make an appeal to the Bible, but also to the professional journals of Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant scholars, and the commentaries of the Bible which they and their churches have produced. On top of all this, we will examine the writings of archaeologists and the discoveries which they have made during the last century in the Holy Land. Much to the consternation of many so-called "Christians", we will discover in the writings of their own scholars a tremendous bulwark of testimony which does in very deed vindicate the revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith and President Young!

# NEW LIGHT ON THE ANCIENT HEBREW/CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE ON DEITY[1]

Part 1

*by*
*Fred C. Collier*

Since its beginnings in 1829, it has been widely acclaimed by both friend and foe that Mormonism represents a radical departure from traditional "Christianity". This is especially so in matters of theology where it concerns the Doctrine of the "Godhead", the "Pre-Existence of Man" and his Relationship to God, as also in "the doctrine of Adam" and the "Fall".

For more than a thousand years the "Christian" church has held

[1]A shorter version of this chapter was delivered at the August 1988 Sunstone Symposium, in Salt Lake City, Utah, when it was voted as the best paper of the year.

**Note:** In most of the translations, and especially the King James, the Divine names as given in the Hebrew are changed to different equivalents in English. For example: "El" is usually rendered as "God" — "Elyon" as "Highest" or "Most

fast to the logic of the Pagan Philosophers, and consequently their characterizations of God have invariably been abstract. "God is a being without body, parts or passions", they have declared. "He is so large that He fills the Universe, and yet so small that He can dwell in your heart" — "His center is everywhere, and His circumference nowhere, and He sits on the top of a topless throne!" These are but typical characterizations which for centuries have been handed down by the church to its people.[2]

In keeping with their immaterialistic doctrine, the flesh is held out to be basically evil, and the Fall of Adam as the greatest catastrophe ever to happen to the human race. Man once had it good in the Garden of Eden, but Adam and Eve botched the whole program! The blame for the presence of sin in the world, and that awful dilemma — that dark door of death is all to be laid at their feet. It was their disobedience which brought Sin and Suffering into the world — they are the cause of all mankind's afflictions. Because of the Fall, man himself is basically depraved, and it is only through the "Grace" of Christ that man can ever amount to anything. Indeed the Gospel was never had among men until the time of Jesus.

This was the theological setting in the year of 1829, when Mormonism was born in upstate New York.[3] But even from its beginning, it was evident that this was not to be the path which Mormonism was destined to pursue. In marked contrast to the pervading dogma of "Christianity", the doctrine of the restoration

---

High", "Shaddai" as "Almighty", "Yahweh" as "LORD", and "Elohim" as "God". At times, I have placed these Divine names back into the text as they are given in the Hebrew, and sometimes I have done it without the nuisance of continual notice. Since the KJV never translates "El" as "El", "Elyon" as "Elyon", "Shaddai" as "Shaddai", "Elohim" as "Elohim", or "Yahweh" as "Yahweh" — for this reason it should be obvious to the reader when this is being done.

[2] For statements on this, see "President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity — an Organized Collection of His Own Statements", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood,* Vol. 4: <Sept 1987> 8–16; Vol. 5: <Feb 1988> 133–136.

[3] For a detailed study on the theological setting at the time of the restoration see *American Religions and the Rise of Mormonism*, by Milton V. Backman, published by Deseret Book Company, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1970.

proclaimed to the world that there had been an apostasy from the true religion of Heaven, and that the restored Church constituted a divine restoration of ancient Christianity.

So far from being immaterialistic, even the Prophet's earliest revelations taught that God had procreated man "in the image of *his own* ***body***." Indeed on two counts man was declared to be the offspring of God — both in a preexistent spirit creation, as well as here on Earth in the flesh.[4]

Years later, in more fully explaining himself, the Prophet said that God Himself was an exalted man[5] and that man was born divine as His progeny.[6] Man's ultimate destiny was to be found in eternal progression as a God,[7] and through right living, the promise is that he will at last become like his Divine Parent, with all the Heavenly Powers, Exaltation and Prerogatives associated therewith.[8]

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL
## ADAM THE NOBLE PATRIARCH AND FATHER OF THE HUMAN RACE

Another theme unique to Mormonism is it's doctrine on Adam and the Fall. Its earliest publication taught that Adam possessed the fulness of the Gospel and the same High Priesthood which would ultimately be held by Melchizedek and Christ.[9] It also declared that he had a knowledge of the Atonement, and the Resurrection.[10] It even taught that the Fall was necessary for the advancement of man, and that it was an inherent part of the *Plan of Salvation*, having been foreordained from before the foundation of the world. "Adam fell

---

[4] Moses 6:8–9, 22; Ether 3:16; Moses 3:4–5

[5] *TPJS* <7 April 1844> 345

[6] For a complete discussion on this subject see "The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine As Joseph Taught It", 3rd enlarged edition, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 5: <April 1988> 19–36 XXX

[7] *TPJS* <7 April 1844> 346–348

[8] D&C 132:15–22

[9] Alma 12:22–32; 13:1–2, 14; *Evening and Morning Star* Vol 1: <Mar 1833> 73.

[10] 2 Nephi 2:11–27; Alma 12:22–35; 22:13–14; Moses 5:4–12

that man might be" it explains, "and man is that he might have joy." Nevertheless, it was necessary that sorrow and sin should enter the world, for "it must needs be that there is an opposition in all things" otherwise "righteousness could not be brought to pass."[11]

A year later, through another revelation it was made known that animal sacrifice had been revealed to Adam[12] as an ordinance foreshadowing the atonement of Christ.[13] Adam was even baptized, and after being filled with the Holy Ghost, "Adam blessed God and . . . began to prophesy concerning all the families of the earth, saying:

> Blessed be the name of God, for because of my transgression *my eyes are opened*, and in this life I shall have joy, and again in the flesh I shall see God. And Eve, his wife, heard all these things and was glad, saying: Were it not for our transgression *we never should have had seed*, and *never should have known good and evil*, and the joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient. (Moses 5:10–11)

Thus rather than being committed to Perdition, in Mormon theology Adam is heralded as the Grand Patriarch of the human race, and the Presiding figure in the Priesthood — Adam was the exalted being to whom the Gospel was first revealed, and through whom it would continue to be revealed, from Adam to Christ and from Christ to the end of time.[14]

## THE LAW OF MOSES A CURSE
## — ISRAEL LOST THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD —

Continuing on, the doctrine of the Restoration teaches that not only did Adam possess the Fullness of the Gospel, but also that it remained on Earth after him, passing down through the lineage of the patriarchs. According to the Prophet's revelation, even the ancient Egyptians possessed a basic knowledge of the Gospel,

---

[11] 2 Nephi 2:25, 11. This same doctrine of opposition in all things was also taught in ancient Canaan. For more on this see: *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961) by Samuel Noah Kramer, pp. 201–202.

[12] Gen 4:3–5

[13] Moses 5:5–7

[14] *TPJS* <Oct 1840> 167

for they sought "earnestly to imitate that order established by the fathers . . . in the days of . . . Adam".[15] It was not until the time of Moses that the fulness of the Gospel was first taken from the Earth.[16] This was the consequence of the whorish practices that had become associated with idolatry,[17] many of which Israel adopted during their 400 year captivity in Egypt. This whoredom was the prevailing culture in the land of Canaan at the time Israel arrived there after their sojourn in Egypt. Because of Israel's apostasy at this time the Lord took the Fullness of the Gospel from the Earth, *and with it, **the knowledge of God***, and left in the stead thereof a ***carnal law***.[18] Hence the world remained veiled in darkness until the advent of Christ, when the Gospel and *the knowledge of God*

[15]Abraham 1:26

[16] JST Ex 34:1–2; JST Deut 10:1–2; D & C 84:19–25, 6–17; 107:40–57; Abraham 1:1–4, 31

[17] For more on this see "The Common Origin of Ancient Hebrew/Pagan Religion and the Demise of the Hebrew Goddess", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 8: <Feb 1991> No. 2.

To be sure, throughout world history there have been many different forms of idolatry, but according to the discoveries of Archaeologists, in the case of the popular form of idolatry which predominated throughout Canaan and the Middle East for thousands of years, the image was not worshipped or thought of as God any more than the LDS worship the Christus statue in the visitors center at Temple Square, or any more than the Catholics worship the statue of Mary in their cathedrals, or the Protestants, Baptists or so called "Born Again Christians" worship the image of Jesus on the Cross which they hang about their neck and on the steeples of their churches. In the case of the idolatry which existed in Canaan, rather than being thought of as God, the idol served as a symbol for God's presence. It was thought that the Spirit of God was brought to possess the idol by special dedication of the priesthood, just as the Israelites and Jews believed that the Spirit of God possessed the Ark of the Covenant and the Temple at Jerusalem, and just as the LDS believe that the Spirit of God possesses their temples. In all of these cases, it was the belief that through their dedication, the Spirit of God would possess the idol, or the Temple, etc. that made them take on the aspect of being "Sacred" or "Holy". Nevertheless, the destruction of the idol, or the destruction of the Temple, or Ark of the Covenant, did not constitute the destruction of God — hence in accordance with ancient belief, both the idol and the Temple were thought of as being separate and apart from God.

[18]D & C 84:19; JST Ex 34:1–2; *TPJS* <27 Aug 1843> 322–323; *The Evening and Morning Star* Vol 2: <May 1834> 154, 147.

was again restored in its fullness.[19]

---

[19] That the Gospel in its fulness, as established by Jesus, was had in the days of the Patriarchs Abraham, Issac and Jacob is affirmed in Hebrews chapter 7, verses 11 through 12. This scripture asks the question:

"If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law [of Moses],) what further need was there that another priest [i.e. Jesus Christ] should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law [of the Priesthood]*." (Heb 7:11–12)

The above statement is based in part upon a Messianic prophecy which is found in the Book of Psalms. Speaking of Christ, it there declares that:

"Yahweh hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou [i.e. the Messiah] art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." (Psalms 110:4)

This scripture states in certain terms that the Messiah would be a Priest after the order of Melchizedek. The point to be made here is that Melchizedek was a Priest/King who lived in the days of Abraham. (Gen 14:18–20) The Book of Hebrews states that perfection did not come through the Levitical Priesthood. In continuing it cites the above passage and interrupts it as a prophecy about Jesus, and then proves by it that according to prophecy, the Messiah was to have the same Priesthood which was held by the great Priest/King Melchizedek, who lived at the time of the Patriarchs, and who blessed Abraham, and to whom Abraham submitted. This Priesthood of Melchizedek was different from the Levitical or Aaronic Priesthood, that was established in the days of Moses and confirmed to be handed down upon the head of Aaron and his descendants after him. The author of Hebrews goes on to explain that inasmuch as Prophecy had declared that at the coming of the Messiah there would be a switch from the Levitical Priesthood to the Priesthood which was held by Melchizedek, that in conjunction with this, there would also of necessity be a corresponding switch or change in the law of the Priesthood and Gospel. As Hebrews chapter 7 verse 12 expresses it: "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law [of the Priesthood]."

What is important to realize from this passage is that this switch in the Priesthood was not to be to a Priesthood order which had never before been had on Earth, but rather the change was to go back to the Priesthood which was held by Melchizedek in the days of Abraham, for according to Prophecy Jesus was to be "a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek". Thus the law of the Priesthood and the Gospel would in like manner have a corresponding change. In other words Jesus would not be under the Law of Moses but rather under the law of the Priesthood and Gospel as it was given to Melchizedek and Abraham. Hence in accordance with prophecy, the law of the Gospel and Priesthood which was to be

## ADAM IS THE CREATOR OF EARTH — HE IS MICHAEL THE ARCHANGEL THE ANCIENT OF DAYS —

Remarkable and far reaching as these teachings are, yet as the theology of the restoration continued to unfold, it became more and more apparent that they represented only the foundation of a superstructure of doctrine, which was yet to be built upon it. Some time between 1830 and 1833, it was revealed that Adam was Michael the Archangel and the Ancient of Days,[20] who is mentioned by the Prophet Daniel,[21] and whom nearly all "Christian" and "Jewish" scholars identify as God the Father.[22] The Prophet even taught that "*Adam came to this Earth from another planet* as an immortalized being" — and *Eve*, rather than being literally created from Adam's rib, was actually *his wife*, whom he brought with him from another creation.[23] In fact Adam as Pre-existent Michael, held "*the Keys of the Universe,"*[24] even before the foundations of the earth were laid, and it was he who performed the primary task of Creation under the direction of his Father and Grandfather God.[25]

On June 27th 1844, the Prophet was brutally murdered by a

---

had through the restoration affected by Jesus, would be patterned after that which was had by Melchizedek and Abraham. Thus the Gospel as Jesus restored it had already existed on Earth at the time of Abraham. In view of this, the meaning of Jesus' statement, that: "Abraham saw my day and rejoiced" (John 8:56) becomes clear. In other words, Abraham knew about the future coming of Jesus, his crucifixion and atonement etc. for he and Melchizedek possessed the Fulness of the Priesthood and the knowledge of the Gospel which by right accompanied it.

[20] D &C 27:11; *UPR* 18:17–22

[21] Dan 7:9, 13, 22

[22] For a complete discussion on this subject see "The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine As Joseph Taught It", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, 3rd enlarged edition, Vol. 5: <April 1988> 31–35.

[23] For the text of the Prophet's statement on this subject see "The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine As Joseph Taught It", 3rd enlarged edition, published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 5: <April 1988> 27.

[24] *TPJS* <2 July 1839> 157

[25] For statements on this see "President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity, An Organized Collection of His Own Statements, Part I", *Doctrine of The Priesthood*, Vol. 4: <Sept 1987> 37. See also *The Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* <2 July 1839> 157.

"Christian" mob, and with his death the growing body of revelation regarding Adam's preexistent life was brought to a sudden halt. As far as sacred history is concerned, the Prophet's death was the greatest loss to the world since the crucifixion of Jesus. The great tragedy was the untimeliness of it all, for the structure of the Kingdom was not yet completed, and its doctrine was not yet fully explained.[26]

But this notwithstanding, without a doubt, the Prophet has left us a rich heritage. Through his teachings he brought man and God closer together. He proclaimed God's humanity by teaching that man was literally created in God's image[27] and that God is an exalted man[28] — even "a personage of Spirit",[29] who possesses "a tabernacle of flesh and bone as tangible as mans".[30] He replaced the ugly and debasing doctrine of total depravity (that great revelation of pagan "Christianity") with the doctrine that man was the literal

---

[26] On August 8th, 1844, during his succession speech, President Young asked the assembled Saints the question "Who knows anything of the Priesthood, or of the organizations of the Kingdom of God?" (TPBY Vol. 1, 8/8/44) Five months later in a private family meeting held on January 8, 1845, he stated that "the Church does not understand the doctrine that Joseph had — [yet] it is plain as the Sun at noon day." (TPBY Vol. 1, 1/8/45) The Prophet had both explained and established the Kingdom and its doctrine in his private councils, but he never lived to explain and give it to the general membership of the Church. After his death, the knowledge of the Kingdom remained with those who had been inducted into the Prophet's private councils, namely the Holy Order and the Council of Fifty, but the whole plan of the Kingdom as envisioned by the Prophet was never brought into practice with the Church as a whole. For all practical purposes the Holy Order was disbanded after the Saints left Nauvoo and by the 1860s the Council of Fifty had been reduced to a 10 year class reunion. By the 1880s new members had been inducted into the 50 who did not share the Prophet's vision and these opposed the doctrine of the Kingdom as established in 1844, and thereby succeeded in creating a political block in the Kingdom. In 1905 the last surviving member of the original Council of Fifty died, and with the exception of a grandson, to whom he communicated the Keys, the Kingdom and its doctrine was taken from the Earth.

[27] *TPJS* <7 April 1844> 345; *WJS* 231

[28] *TPJS* <7 April 1844> 345

[29] *UPR* 5:2

[30] D&C 130:22; "The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine as Joseph Taught It", 3rd ed. *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 5: <April 1988> 18–20.

offspring of Deity[31] — born divine, to live out eternity as Gods, on a never ending path, going forever forward into Eternal Progression.[32] The Prophet rescued Adam from the theological pit of the damned, into which the sectarians had cast him, and through the revelation of Heaven, Adam was revealed in a new light as the noble Father and Patriarch of the human race — even a savior, who gave his life "that man might be".[33] But with all the Prophet's accomplishments, still at his death his life's work was incomplete, for the end of the story was not yet told. He had lived to proclaim God's humanity — but he never lived to publicly proclaim that Adam was God.[34] His untimely death would leave this task for Brigham Young and it would be another eight years in coming.

## BRIGHAM PROCLAIMS
## — THE DOCTRINE OF ADAM-GOD —

The first public announcement of the doctrine that Adam was God the Father came on the evening of April 9th, 1852. The occasion was the annual Priesthood Conference for the Elders of the Church. False doctrine had been circulating among the brethren regarding the identity of the Father of Jesus and President Young chose the Priesthood conference as the proper time and place to proclaim the doctrine:

> Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a *celestial body*, and brought Eve, *one of his wives,* with him. He helped to make and organize this World. He is MICHAEL, *the Archangel*, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about Whom holy men have written and spoken — HE *is our* FATHER *and our* GOD, *and the only God with whom* WE *have*

[31] Moses 6:8–9, 22; *TPJS* <16 June 1844> 373; *UPR* 61:17–18

[32] *TPJS* <7 April 1844> 346–348; 374–375

[33] 2 Nephi 2:25

[34] According to President Young the Prophet taught the Adam-God doctrine in private but he never proclaimed it to the public. For more on this see text immediately following this note. For a detailed discussion see "The Trinity And The Holy Spirits — The Doctrine As Joseph Taught It", 3rd enlarged edition, published in *Doctrine Of The Priesthood*, Vol. 5: <April 1988> 22–36.

*to do*. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or nonprofessing, must hear it, and *will know it sooner or later*. (*Journal of Discourses* 1: <9 April 1852> 50; *TPBY* 3:92–93 emphasis in original)

Nearly two years later, in another effort to correct false doctrine, President Young again spoke upon this subject:

Who was the Saviour begotten by? . . . . . [He was begotten by] His Father, and his Father is our God, and the Father of our spirits, and He is the framer of the body. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ — Who is He? He is Father Adam — Michael — the Ancient of Days. (*TPBY* 3: <19 Feb 1854> 251–252)

Throughout the remainder of his life, President Young consistently testified that this doctrine had been taught to him by the Prophet Joseph Smith, and that he, personally, had learned the truthfulness of it by direct revelation from God. Six years later on April 4th, 1860, in a meeting between the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve, President Young stated that:

It was Joseph's doctrine that Adam was God. . . . God comes to earth and eats and partakes of fruit. Joseph could not reveal what was revealed to him, and if Joseph had it revealed, he was not told to reveal it (Minutes of meeting held at the Historian's Office, April 4, 1860, Brigham Young papers, Church Historian's Office; *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 5: <January 1988> 107)

Seven years later at a meeting of the School of the Prophets, President Young said that:

Adam was Michael the Archangel and he was the Father of Jesus Christ and was our God and that Joseph taught this Principle. (*Wilford Woodruff Journal*, December 16, 1867)

On May 18, 1873, he stated:

I have had many revelations; I have seen and heard for myself, and know these things are true . . . . . What I know concerning God . . . I have received from the heavens (*JD* 16: <18 May 1873> 46)

Again, in a public address given on June 8th, 1873, he exclaimed:

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, *and which God revealed*

*to me* — NAMELY THAT ADAM IS OUR FATHER AND GOD. (*Deseret News,* Vol. 22: <June 18, 1873> 308)

A little over a year before his death, he reiterated the same doctrine, and again affirmed that "Joseph" had taught that "Adam was our Father and God".[35]

## MORMONISM
## — IS IT CHRISTIAN? —

As is evident from the above, the doctrine which was advanced by the Restoration constitutes a radical departure from traditional "Christian" theology — and it is for this reason (among others) that our enemies have cried out against us, and refused to acknowledge the Mormon faith as a "Christian" religion. "Polytheists"* — "Heathens" — "Idolators" they exclaim! Today things are such that you cannot go to Conference without seeing anti-Mormons standing at the gate of Temple Square, passing out literature about Adam-God. Generally speaking we have become an easy mark. All they have to do is prove that it was taught — and this is easy to do — and once they have done it, the argument is over. After suffering this embarrassment, all we can do is hide our shame by sticking our heads in the sand. No one would ever *think* that a doctrine so fantastic as Adam-God could be found in the Bible!

The challenge has gone out from our enemies, and they have made it clear, that the only meeting ground is for us to renounce our prophets, and with them all their revelations. Either this or we must remain branded forever as unchristian. But before we should aggrandize our antagonists, we ought to intently consider the question — what is a Christian? Is a Christian merely someone who believes in Jesus? Certainly, this is not the doctrine set forth by the Restoration — nor is it to be found in the New Testament.[36] In order to be a true "Christian", not only must we believe in Jesus, but *we must also believe in* ***what Jesus taught***. Not only so, but we must endeavor with all our heart, *might, mind, strength and soul* ***to live it***.

---

[35]St. George, Historical Record, May 14, 1876, Church Historian's Office, SLC, Ut..

[36]Matt 7:21–27; Luke 6:46–49

This is the doctrine of the Restoration, and it is the doctrine which I believe in! It is far better for us to go forward and Conquer, than to ***deny the faith*** for the sake of *Friendship with the World*.

In this one issue, I am in complete agreement with the "christians" — our doctrine is radically different from their's, and it is impossible for both the Mormons and the "christians" to be Christian! The real question then is: Whose doctrine does the historical record Vindicate — that of the Restoration, or that of the so called "Christians"? Let us consider this question well — but before we commence our investigation, let us examine the nature of the problem and the challenge, and lay a foundation for discovery.

### — A FOUNDATION FOR DISCOVERY —

To begin with, if the teachings of the Restoration are true — if Adam really did have the Gospel — and if it remained on Earth until Moses — then we would expect to find Gospel themes written in the religious literature of those civilizations which descended from him. In other words, we would expect that all peoples and nations which descended from Adam would preserve in their culture and religion the basic seeds of their beginnings. In like manner, if the aforementioned doctrine regarding Father Adam is a part of the Gospel, and if it was had on Earth from Adam to Moses, then we would expect to find clear indications of it in the literature of ancient civilizations. The same would apply to the doctrine of the Resurrection and Atonement, and belief in a Son of God-Savior figure, such as Jesus. We would also expect to find preserved in ancient records clear indications of belief in the Preexistence and a Spirit Creation, as well as the ordinance of Baptism by Immersion.

Again, if there is any truth to the story of the Tower of Babel — and the Book of Mormon would argue that there is[37] — then we would expect that the same basic culture which was introduced by Adam came down as a cohesive whole to the people of that time. And we would expect that at the confounding of the tongues, the social fabric fractured causing groups to split off and form different

[37]Book Of Mormon, Ether 1:3–5, 33

nationalities. But this notwithstanding, even after the confounding of the tongues, we would expect to find the same basic culture, ideas, and religion which existed before, with only one difference — it would all be spoken in different tongues. In other words, their Gods would all be called by different names, but the stories and concepts behind them would be basically the same.

Again, if the Egyptians had an imitation of the Gospel as the Prophet Joseph Smith has taught us,[38] then we would expect that the archaeological and historical records of Egypt would tell of a religion which in many respects would resemble that of the Patriarchs, as well as that of Jesus in New Testament times.[39]

Again, if the doctrine of the Restoration is true, and the Fulness of the Gospel was taken away at the time of Moses, because of the whoredom which had become associated with it — then we would expect that after the Law of Moses was given, the religion of the Patriarchs would, in many respects, be hidden, buried, denounced, and denied, until the time of Christ, when circumstances would again be healthy for its Restoration. These are the basic issues and questions which ought to be examined in the light of biblical teachings, as well as that of ancient history and archeology.

### — MODERN IDOLATRY — BIBLE WORSHIP —

I used to go to the state fair and when I went, I would always visit the anti-Mormon exhibits. On one occasion I got talking to a Baptist who was attending Bible school in preparation for the ministry. When he started talking about Salvation by Grace, insisting as they generally do, that works are not a necessary factor in the *Plan of Salvation*, I asked him — inasmuch as the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have confessed Jesus

---

[38]Abraham 1:25–27

[39]*Kings and Gods of Egypt*, by Alexandre Moret, published in G. P. Putnam's Sons New York and London The Knickerbocker Press, 1912, pp. 69–108; *The Monuments and the Old Testament, Light from the Near East on the Scriptures*, by Ira Maurice Price, Ph. D., published by Philadelphia The Judson Press, pp. 98–130; *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri*, by Hugh Nibley, published by Deseret Book Company, 1975.

— why is it that you would deny them Salvation?

His answer was that "Mormons do not believe in the right theological Jesus — they are *polytheists** and no polytheist can be saved!" In other words Mormons have an extra task put upon them — all the other "Christians" can believe in any one of a thousand different and contradictory doctrines, but they are all saved in a pile regardless — but the Mormons must believe in true theology or they will be damned — in other words, only Mormons must have works!

In process of our discussion I asked him whether or not he thought the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would be heirs of Salvation and he answered that they would. I then began to point out to him, that in keeping with the archaeological and historical discoveries of this century, most "Christian" scholars have now come to the conclusion that the Patriarchs were Polytheists — even the Bible bears witness of it — and it is now regarded as a fact — and no honest scholar will deny it!

Much to my surprise, the individual to whom I was speaking acknowledged the truth of what I had said, and I have since found many others who will do the same — but only when they are pushed into a corner! They do not like to talk about it in a proselyting situation, but the fact that the Patriarchs were polytheists is becoming common knowledge among those who are schooled in the ministry.

"Well then", I asked, "how can you consistently deny Salvation to the Mormons on the grounds that they are Polytheists, and still believe that the Patriarchs will receive Salvation, even though by your own admission, they also were polytheists?"

"Well", he said, rather chagrined, "because today we have the Bible, but the Patriarchs did not!"

This is an Incredible Revelation! The Bible tells us that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob received personal Visitations from God[40] — on one occasion Abraham even washed God's feet,[41] and the Almighty so honored Abraham that He sat at Abraham's table and dined with

---

[40]Gen 12:1–3, 7; 13:14–17; 15:1–21; 17:1–3; 18:1–33; 22:1–2, 11–18; 26:1–2, 24; 32:24–30; 35:9–15

him.[42] In fact, the Bible portrays Abraham as being so close to the Lord, that he is actually declared to be "the friend of God".[43] The same holds true with Isaac and Jacob — they knew God personally, for they had seen Him face to face.

What is incredible is that the "Christians" could ever believe that it is more blessed to read about such experiences in a book, than it is to experience them personally in real life. In other words, they believe that they are more favored than the Patriarchs because they have the book that tells the story. After all, with a Bible in your hand, who needs God or Revelation!

It would seem that the "Christians" have converted to a new form of "Idolatry" — "Bible-worship", as they call it! They have virtually replaced God with the Bible — a god composed of wood pulp and ink — covered with black cowhide leather, and pages that are lined with Gold — set high upon the podium before the people, where all can both see and worship! How truly did the Book of Mormon prophesy of them — "A Bible! A Bible! We have got a Bible" they exclaim, "and there cannot be any more Bible", yea, "we need no more Bible"![44] Indeed, there cannot be any more Bible, because the Living God no longer sees fit to speak to His children. It is no longer necessary, for God has given us the Bible, which is wholly adequate to answer all the perplexing questions about Life and Death, Earth, Heaven and Hell!

Well, let us go to the "Christian" Bible — Let us look into "their" Golden God of Gold leafed pages, and see if these "Christians" are really Christian. Let us see if they venerate their Golden God for the truth that it contains, or just simply as a time honored relic — a keepsake which has been handed down from past ages, and which as President Young so aptly expressed it, is shut and "sealed up, never to be opened"[45] or understood by the people!

---

[41] Gen 18:4

[42] Gen 18:5

[43] James 2:23; Isa. 41:8; 2 Chron 20:7

[44] 2 Nephi 29:3, 6

## — THE GOD OF ABRAHAM —

One of the most important discoveries ever made relating to the Bible, came in 1929, when the ancient city-state of Ugarit was discovered during an archaeological dig. Ugarit was located on the Northern end of the coast of Canaan, about 260 miles from Jerusalem. Virtually thousands upon thousands of clay tablets were discovered there which date back to the 14th century B.C. Through this discovery, tremendous light has been thrown on the religion and culture of ancient Canaan and Israel. Among other things, scholars have come to realize what they should have already known from other sources — namely, that the proper name for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was El.[46]

In accordance with archaeological discoveries which have been made, both at Ugarit and elsewhere, "El" is "the oldest Semitic* term for God".[47] Not only was it in common use throughout the ancient Near East, it also occurs 238 times in the Old Testament,

---

[45]*JD* <26 May 1872> 15:41–42

[46]Ulf Oldenburg, in his dissertation *"The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion*" states the following:

"Yahweh is also called El. That El is a proper name and not only an appellative, meaning "god," is proven by several passages in the Bible. According to the Genesis account, El revealed himself to Abraham and led him into Canaan where not only Abraham and his family worshiped El, but also the Canaanites themselves." (p. 1–2)

Not only do numerous passages in the Bible declare that the Hebrew word "El" is a proper name for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but Sanchuniathon's "Phoenician History" which has been known among scholars since the third century AD also declares that El was the proper name for the head god of the ancient Phoenician/Canaanite pantheon.

Sanchuniathon was an ancient Phoenician writer who lived in Beirut before the Trojan war in the 13th or 14th century B.C. All information about him is derived from Philo of Byblos (flourished AD 100), who claimed to have translated Sanchuniathon's *Phoenicia* into Greek from the original text. The authenticity of that claim has been questioned, but excavations at Ras Shamra (ancient Ugarit) in Syria in 1929 revealed Phoenician documents supporting much of Sanchuniathon's information on Phoenician mythology and religious beliefs. According to Philo, Sanchuniathon derived the sacred lore from inscriptions on the Ammouneis (i.e. images or pillars of Baal Amon), which stood in Phoenician temples. Fragments

appearing in both early and late texts. Its normal biblical usage is as a simple appellative — it is a synonym of the more common noun Eloheim, "God." However at times the Bible also employs the word El as a proper name for the God of the Patriarchs Abraham, lsaac and Jacob.[48]

*The Westminster Historical Atlas To The Bible*[49] states the following:

Unfortunately, we lack precise knowledge of the nature of Abraham's religion, but a number of features have been clarified. Particularly important is the apparent fact that the name of the patriarchal family God was "El Shaddai". . . (Ex. 6:2, 3. Gen. 17:1; etc.) (*The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible,* p. 26a–26b)

*The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible*[50] states that "It is difficult to reconstruct the religion of the patriarchal period for the traditions have been reworked in the light of the Yahweh faith." In continuing it states that:

The religion designated by the expression "the God of the fathers" (cf.

---

of Philo's translation were preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea, who quoted from Philo's translation in his book "Preparation for the Gospel", which was written about 315 A.D. (See "*The Conflict Between El And Baal In Canaanite Religion*, by Ulf Oldenburg, p. 1–13; also *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Micropaedia*, Vol viii, p. 843)

[47] *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 7:674

[48] *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume*, p. 256–257.

[49] *The Westminster Historical Atlas To The Bible Revised Edition* was published by a Presbyterian publishing house, namely, "The Westminster Press" in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. It was edited by George Ernest Wright, who was Professor of Old Testament History and Theology, at McCormick Theological Seminary and Floyd Vivian Filson, who was Professor of New Testament Literature and History at McCormick Theological Seminary, with an introductory article by William Foxwell Albright, who was Professor of Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins University.

[50] The following is taken from the dust jacket and back of volume one:

"THE INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE is the work of 253 skilled writers — planned and completed under the direction of George A. Buttrick,

Exod. 3:6) was undoubtedly polytheistic as Josh. 24:2 explicitly states, and in many respects was part and parcel of the El-worship of the ancient Semites. This is implied by P's* statement that in the pre-Mosaic period Yahweh made himself known as El Shaddai, and perhaps also by the E* practice of using the Semitic name Elohim. . . . . This word appears frequently in the Old Testament as a name for deity ("God," "gods"). Being plural in form, it echoes ancient polytheism, like the name El, to which it is closely related." (*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol 2:411, 413)

Werner Keller in his famous book, "*The Bible as History*",[51] wrote that:

when the Biblical fathers called upon *El-Elyon* (the 'all highest'), *El-Olam* (the 'ancient of ancients', 'the eternal'), *El-Roy* ('he who appears', 'he who sees me') and *El-Shaddai* ('the highest' or 'almighty'), their prayers were directed, as many scholars believe, to the chief Canaanite god El in one of

editor; associate editors Thomas S. Kepler, John Knox, Herbert Gordon May, and Samuel Terrien; and Emory Stevens Bucke.

"THE INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE is the most comprehensive and up-to-date work of its kind. It draws fully upon man's accumulated knowledge of the Bible and other relevant data and documents.

"For the minister it is a ready, all-purpose resource work for almost every phase of biblical inquiry. For church and Sunday-school teachers this dictionary will quicken the study and use of the Bible and greatly add both to knowledge and to teaching resources. For educators and students it is a comprehensive reference.

* * * * * *

"[As of 1962] This is the only complete and up-to-date dictionary of the Bible in English in many years — THE INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, [is] an illustrated encyclopedia more than five years in the making. Never before has there been a dictionary like this: all the knowledge of modern scholarship set forth in a lucid, readable style; an immediate reference for all Bible students.

"With this dictionary words and phrases, places people, and things in the Bible gather light and meaning. Difficult passages are clarified by the help of this biblical resource."

*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* is published by "Abingdon" (a United Methodist publishing house) at Nashville.

[51]For over two decades *The Bible as History* has been a standard text on biblical investigation. First published in 1955, it has been translated into twenty-four languages and sold more than 10 million copies. Its author, Dr. Werner Keller was

his local variants. (*The Bible as History Second Revised Edition,* 268)

The conclusions expressed in the above statements are based upon a better understanding of the ancient Hebrew language, particularly with regard to the word "El" as it has been clarified through the above mentioned discovery. This enlightened understanding is expressed in some of the newer translations of the Bible. *The Jerusalem Bible*[52] for example translates Exodus 6:2–3 as follows:

God spoke to Moses and said to him, 'I am Yahweh. To Abraham and Isaac and Jacob I appeared as *El Shaddai; I did not* make myself known to them by my name Yahweh. (*The Jerusalem Bible*, Exodus 6:2–3)

---

born in Germany in 1909 and was early recognized as one of the foremost journalists in the scientific field. His greatest interests have always been archaeology and the story of mankind, and in pursuit of these he has traveled extensively in Italy, Balkans, and the Middle East. He decided to write *The Bible as History* in 1950, after studying the sensational French reports on the findings of the ancient Phoenician port of Ugarit and of the home of the patriarchs in the Kingdom of Mari on the Euphrates.

[52]The Jerusalem Bible was first published in England in 1966. It was translated by a team of 28 English speaking Roman Catholics, who worked under the direction of Alexander Jones of Christ's College, in Liverpool, England. Notwithstanding this, in actuality *The Jerusalem Bible* is an English parallel of an earlier French translation which was produced in Jerusalem by a team of 40 French speaking Roman Catholics. These scholars were members of the Dominican Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem and worked under the direction of the late Roland de Vaux. (See also footnotes 53 and 54) It is from the fact that the work of translation was done in Jerusalem that *The Jerusalem Bible* derives its name. The French translation was first published serially between 1948 and 1954, with the first one volume edition being published in France in 1955. It was accompanied by an extensive commentary with introductions to books and copious annotations. These fascicles, are being continuously revised. But in 1961 the fascicles as they then existed were collected, abbreviated, and compressed into La Bible de Jerusalem. The English text generally follows the interpretation established by the French translation and commentary, but was made with reference to the original Hebrew and Greek languages and is accompanied by revised notes. Unfortunately, those scholars who prepared the French work are not listed in the English edition.

In spite of its Catholic origin, and the Catholic orientation of some of its commentary, generally speaking *The Jerusalem Bible* is well received by scholars in the Protestant camp. (*The English Bible From KJV to NIV A History and Evalu-*

The late Roland De Vaux,[53] another eminent "Christian" scholar, explains this verse as follows:

It is, of course, true that the religion of the patriarchs was identified with that of the people of Israel in biblical tradition, in other words, that Abraham worshipped the same god as Moses. Each of the three sources expresses this conviction in its own way. According to the *Elohist* the god who revealed himself to Moses as Yahweh was the god of the fathers, 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob' (Exod 3:6, 15). According to the *priestly author,* Yahweh was the same god as the god who appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai (Exod 6:3). *The Yahwist* therefore used the name Yahweh in all the patriarchal stories from the call of Abraham onwards (Gen 12:1) and even made the worship of

---

*ation*, by Jack P. Lewis, pp. 199–200; *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* Vol. 1:581; *The Oxford Dictionary Of The Christian Church*, by F. L. Cross, p. 172)

[53]Roland De Vaux (1903–1971), was a Roman Catholic and Biblical scholar and archaeologist. Born in Paris, he became a member of the Dominican Order in 1929. From 1945 to 1965 De Vaux served as director of the Ecole Biblique et Archeologique Francaise in Jerusalem, where he was professor of Palestinian archaeology from 1934. From 1938 to 1953 he was the editor of the *Revue Biblique*, in which he has written most of his articles, and from 1947 on he was editor in chief of the *Bible de Jerusalem.* Having played one of the leading roles in the Qumran discoveries [i.e. The Dead Sea Scrolls], he was also the editor in chief of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (1955– ). De Vaux began his archaeological career at Ma'in (biblical Beth-Baal-Meon) in 1937 and successively carried out excavations at Abu-Gosh (1944); Tell el Far'ah (1946–1960), which he identified with biblical Tirzah; Qumran and 'Ain Feshkha (1949–58); Murabba'at (1952); and Jerusalem (1961–63).

In his books as well as in his articles, he always sought to combine the rigorous use of the "internal criticism" of the Biblical traditions together with the criticism of the "external evidence of the Bible." Thus, for him, as a biblical scholar, archaeology is primarily a tool of biblical investigation and will, occasionally, bring an "external confirmation" to the traditions recorded in the written sources. But as an independent discipline, archaeology purports only to study the material remains of the past, and its results do not always have a direct bearing on the Bible. His major work, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (trans. from French, 2 Vols. 1961, 1965), is a good illustration of this methodology. (*Encyclopaedia Judaica* Vol. 16:80)

[54]*The Early History of Israel* 275. *The Early History of Israel* was translated

Yahweh go back to the very origins of man himself, to the time of Enosh [i.e. Enos in KJV], Seth's son (Gen 4:26).

The *Elohist* and the *priestly writer*, however both emphasize quite strongly the difference; in other words, that *Yahweh was a new name which was to replace those [names for God which were] used by the patriarchs*. (*The Early History of Israel* 267–68)

In continuing, De Vaux cited several of the aforementioned passages in Genesis, referring particularly to "El Elyon", "El Roi", "El Shaddai", "El Olam" and "El Bethel" and then concluded by affirming that, "*it is generally accepted" that these names "are different forms of the same great god El,* a deity whom the Ras Shamrah [i.e. Ugaratic] texts have made better known."[54]

Erdman's *Theological Dictionary Of The Old Testament*[55] provides us with additional information — stating that each of these different names was tied to a specific Patriarchal sanctuary in Canaan:

In the patriarchal narratives of Genesis, there is a series of names or appellations of deity beginning with the element '*el* combined with a

from French into English by David Smith, and published by The Westminster Press, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. English Translation: Copyright in 1978. The Westminister Press is a Presbyterian owned publishing House.

"*The Early History Of Israel*" was "the last important contribution to the sphere of Old Testament studies made by Roland De Vaux (see footnotes 53 and 54) who devoted his whole life to the Word of God and to the history of the people of God." (R. Tournay, O.P., Director, Ecole Biblique Archeologique Francaise, Jerusalem., dust jacket on back of *The Early History Of Israel*.)

[55]*The Theological Dictionary Of The Old Testament* Vol. 1 is the first volume of the authorized and unabridged translation of *Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Alten Testament*. It was edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, and Translated into English by John T. Willis.

G. Johannes Botterweck is Professor of Old Testament, Faculty of Catholic Theology at Rheinische Friedrick-Wilhelms-Universitat in Bonn, West Germany.

Helmer Ringgren is Professor of Old Testament Interpretation at the University of Uppsala, Sweden.

John T. Willis is Associate Professor of Bible at Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas.

*The Theological Dictionary Of The Old Testament* Vol. 1 was copyrighted in

substantive or adjective, among them *'el 'olam*, "the Everlasting God" (Gen. 21:33) . . . *'el 'elyon*, "God Most High" (Gen 14:18ff.; in v. 22 . . .) *'el shaddai*, "God Almighty" (this is in Priestly contexts: Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; and Ex. 6:3; . . .) *'el' elohe yisra'el*, "God, the God of Israel" (33:20), and *'el ro'i*, "a God of seeing" (16:13). These epithets are tied to specific patriarchal sanctuaries or altars — El 'olam to Beer-sheba, El Elyon to Jerusalem, El Elohe Israel to Shechem, El Ro'i to Beer-lahai-roi. El Shaddai, unlike the other epithets, is not firmly rooted in tradition,

---

1974. The complete 14 Volume set is currently published by "William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company", in Grand Rapids, Michigan, which is a prominent Christian publishing house.

The following introductory statement to this work is taken from the dust jacket of volume 1:

"With this volume a major project has been launched, which promises to be as fundamental to Old Testament studies as its companion set, the Kittel-Friedrich *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, has been to study of the New Testament.

"Beginning with Abh, "father," and continuing through the alphabet, the key Hebrew and Aramaic words of the Old Testament are discussed in depth. Leading scholars of various faiths (including Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, Greek Orthodox and Jewish), and from around the world (Denmark, France, Great Britain, Greece, Holland, Israel, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States, as well as East and West Germany), have been carefully selected for each article by Editors Botterweck and Ringgren and their consultants, George W. Anderson, Henri Cazelles, David Noel Freedman, Shemarjahu Talmon, and Gerhard Wallis.

"The intention of the writers is to concentrate on meaning, starting from the narrower, everyday senses and building to an understanding of theologically significant concepts. To avoid artificially restricting the focus of the articles the way many theological dictionaries do, *TDOT* considers under each key word the larger groups of words that are related linguistically or semantically. The lexical work includes detailed surveys of a word's occurrences, not only in biblical material but elsewhere in the ancient Near East as well. Sumerian, Akkadian, Egyptian, Ethiopic, Ugaritic, and North Semitic sources are surveyed, among others, as well as the Qumran texts and the Septuagint; and in cultures where no cognate word exists, often cognate ideas are considered.

The emphasis, though, is on Hebrew terminology and on biblical usage. Besides philology, form-critical and traditio-historical methods are employed, with the aim of understanding the religious statements in the Old Testament. Extensive bibliographical information adds to the value of this reference work."

[56]*The Early History of Israel* 280–281

though P attaches it to Bethel in Gen 48:3. (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 1:255)

It is worthy of note that archaeological findings indicate that these El sanctuaries were already in existence before Abraham entered Canaan[56] — in other words, Abraham was not the founder of El worship. It would appear that El worship was the original religion of Canaan, going clear back to Shem, the birthright son of Noah and father of the Semitic race. Not only so, but evidence would indicate that Canaan, the son of Ham (cursed son of Noah) passed the same religion down to his descendants, just as the Prophet Joseph Smith has told us in the Book of Abraham,[57] for El worship was prevalent even among the Canaanites!

It is also significant that many of the El sanctuaries were still standing and in use when the Children of Israel entered Canaan under Joshua, and even though they were commanded to utterly destroy the alters, images, trees and sanctuaries of other Gods in Canaan, yet an injunction was placed upon them that they were not to violate the sanctuaries of El. At the same time it is also significant that they were commanded to worship elsewhere, which would indicate that the patriarchal sanctuaries had been desecrated. Before the children of Israel entered Canaan, the Lord commanded them saying:

> These are the statutes and judgments, which ye shall observe to do in the land, which Yahweh Eloheim of thy fathers giveth thee . . . . Ye shall utterly destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their Gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and *under every green tree*: and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and burn their *groves* with fire; and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place." (Deut 12:1–4)

---

On this count, it is significant that in accordance with a revelation given to the Prophet Joseph Smith (Moses 6:17), the promised land of Cainan was originally settled by Enos and his son Cainan, after whom the land was named. This same "Enos" was the grandson of Adam, birthright heir of Seth and possessor of the Priesthood. It is therefore, not at all unlikely that the altars to El which Abraham found in Cainan, at the time of his migration, had their origins with the Patriarchs who preceded him.

[57] Abraham 1:25–27

[58] See note 81. The Old Testament fusion of El with Yahweh is clearly stated

Interestingly, after delivering this devastating edict, the Lord places a strange injunction upon them:

> Ye shall not do so unto Yahweh your Eloheim. But unto the place which Yahweh your Eloheim shall choose . . . to put his name there, *even* unto his habitation shall ye seek . . . and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings (Deut 12:4–6)

Certainly the Lord is not here making reference to sanctuaries which were not in existence. It would be pointless for Yahweh to command Israel not to destroy His alters and sacred places, etc. in Canaan if none existed. The one obvious deduction is that reference was here being made to the sanctuaries of El which existed in Canaan at the time of the Patriarchs. Some might argue that it is "Yahweh/Elohim" who is referred to in the above passage and not El. This however is a moot point, for the titles El, Yahweh and Eloheim consistently alternate with each other throughout the Old Testament. Not only so, but this would still leave the sanctuaries of Yahweh/El which preexisted in Canaan before Joshua.[58]

## THE ATTRIBUTES OF EL

We cannot begin to comprehend the significance of the fact that the Patriarchs subscribed to El worship until we first learn something respecting the nature of the religion. *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*, states that the religion of the Patriarchs, "was based on a close personal, contractual relationship between the leader of a family and the God (El)":

---

in some of the newer translations of Exodus chapter 6. *The New Jerusalem Bible* states: "God spoke to Moses and said to him, 'I am Yahweh. To Abraham, Isaac and Jacob I appeared as El Shaddai, but I did not make my name Yahweh known to them." (Exodus 6:2–3)

Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* States that, "El in Biblical tradition is often used simply as an alternate name of Yahweh". It goes on to say that "The distribution of the use of El as a proper name equivalent to Yahweh is highly irregular and hence significant." It also states that:

El is rarely if ever used in the Bible as a proper name of a non-Israelite, Canaanite deity in the full consciousness of a distinction between El and Yahweh, God of Israel. (*TDOT* 1:258, 253)

Tradition mentions the "God of Abraham" (Gen. 31:53), the "Kinsman of Isaac" (31:42), and the "Mighty one of Jacob" (49:24; cf Isa. 1:24). The patriarchal god was not bound to a holy place, but to a family whose leader had chosen him in response to a special visitation. . . . . .

A cluster of names, such as, . . . "father"; . . . "brother"; [and] . . . "kinsman," were used in antiquity to express the very close family relation between the deity and his worshipers. We have already noticed that patriarchal religion was of this type, as illustrated in the divine name "Kinsman . . . of Isaac". . . . The conception of family kinship with the deity is reflected in personal names like Eliab, "My God is Father" (Num. 1:9; 1 Sam. 16:6); Ahiezer, "My [divine] Brother is help" (Num. 1:12); or Ammishaddai, "[The god of] my Kindred is Shaddai" (Num. 1:12). The

---

*The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* states that in Biblical usage, "Yahweh and El have been thoroughly merged. When used as a proper name, El never designates a deity clearly distinct from Yahweh." In contrasting El's acceptance in Israel as God with that of Baal, it states that "The Israelite identification of Yahweh with El took place without the bitter conflict which characterized the confrontation of Yahweh and Baal." It then surmises that "The difference in the two cases probably lies in the Israelite perception of the essential identity of El and Yahweh." In concluding it even suggests that "the very name Yahweh may have originated as a cultic epithet for El." (*IDB*, Supplementary Vol. 257–258) Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* enlarges on this idea even further:

The phenomenon of the use of El as a proper name for Israel's God has some implications for the history of religion. Eissfeldt has argued strenuously that the free use of El epithets by Israel for their God on the one side, and the rejection and indeed hostility of Yahwists to the use of Ba'al-Haddu names and epithets on the other side, require explanation if the reconstruction of the origins of Yahweh is to be successful.

The wide overlap in attributes, epithets, and names of Yahweh with El suggests that Yahweh originated as an El figure, splitting apart from the old god as the cult of Israel separated and diverged from *its polytheistic context*. The failure of polemic against El, and the free use of his image as *the patriarch of the divine assembly,* all tend to support such a thesis. We have argued elsewhere that the name Yahweh itself originated as a hypocoristicon of a liturgical title of El, of the type beginning with a verbal element, a familiar phenomenon in Amorite and Canaanite divine names and appellatives. Such a liturgical formula would be *'El du Yahwe ts bha oth* or the like, "El who creates the (heavenly) armies" (cf. 3l mlk d yknn above), an appropriate epithet of El. (*TDOT* 1:260)

[59] *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol, 1:940 –941; for the text of this citation, see note 154.

ancient Semitic background of these divine names is the view that the god was actually ***a blood relative*** of the clan or family, whose members were by the same token sons, brothers, and kinsmen of the god. (*IDB* 2:412, 415)

Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* brings perfect clarity to the whole concept when it states that, "*The one image of El that seems to tie all his myths together is* ***that of the patriarch***. He is the ***primordial father*** *of gods and men":*

> El is creator, the ancient one, whose extraordinary ***procreative powers*** *have populated heaven and earth*

In explaining further, it states that:

> While . . . [El] has taken on royal prerogatives and epithets, he stands closer to the patriarchal judge ruling over the *council of the gods*. He is at once *father of the family of gods and ruler,* functions brought together in the human sphere only in those societies which are organized in tribal leagues or in kingdoms where ***kinship survives as an organizing power*** *in the society*. (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament,* 1:253)

Another way to acquaint ourselves with El worship is to become familiar with some of the many names or epithets by which El was known:

> A number of epithets reveal El as ***father*** and ***creator***. He is called . . . '*Bull El* his father, King El who created him." . . . . . The epithet "Bull'" is noteworthy. . . . One may compare, for example, the epithet of the patriarchal god, the . . . "*Bull of Jacob" . . . .*
>
> A like epithet is, *"Creator of Creatures*", and '*b 'dm, "Father of Man."*. . . In CTA, 10 [IV AB], we find yet another El epithet: . . . "indeed our creator is eternal/indeed *ageless he who formed us"*' [compare Deut. 32:18] Yet another formula used of El is . . . "*thy patriarch*." In later texts we find the liturgical name . . . "*El, creator of Earth."*
>
> Another series of epithets describe El as the "ancient one" or the "eternal one" with grey beard and concomitant wisdom. . . .
>
> In *Ugaritica*, V a new text has been published which applies to El the familiar biblical epithet . . . "Eternal King". A similar epithet of El is . . . "*King father of Years," reminiscent of biblical . . . "Eternal father," and*

*"Ancient of days"*" (Isa. 9:5 [Eng. v. 6]; Dnl. 7:9; cf. Isa 40:28) . . .

A third group of epithets reveal El as *merciful and benign*: . . . "the kindly One, El the Compassionate." [and] . . . "*merciful one*." [reminiscent of New Testament *"Father of Mercies" (2 Cor.1:3) and Old Testament "Jehovah El, Merciful and gracious" (Exodus 34:6) and "Merciful El" (Deut. 4:31; see also Neh 9:31; Jonah 4:10; Psa. 86:15).*] . . . . .

The picture of El's abode. . . . . fits with the biblical description of "Eden, [as Ezekiel expressed it] the garden of God at the mount of God, guarded by the cherub(im)" (Ezk. 28:2, 13f., 16). The mythic pattern which couples the cosmic river with the mount of God (the place where the gates of heaven and hell are found) is reflected in Gen. 2:10, where the waters springing from *Eden* are divided, one identified as Gihon. Perhaps the most extraordinary identification of Zion with the cosmic mount of assembly is Ps. 48:3(2) where Zion, Yahweh's holy mountain, is given the name . . . "the Far North." (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament,* 1:245–247, 249–250)

You will notice that the above citation suggests the likelihood of a connection between the biblical "El the God of Israel" and "the Ancient of Days", listing some of the epithets by which El was known such as: "b dm", "Father of Man" "El is . . . thy patriarch", "the ancient one", "the eternal one", "Eternal King," and "King father of Years." The *Encyclopedia Judaica*, also suggests a connection, pointing out as it does that, two of the epithets by which El was known are "the King, Father of Years," and "Father Adam," or as the case might be, "Father [of] Man[kind]".[59]

In the Hebrew-Canaanite dialect the word "adm" is used interchangeable, both for the personal name "Adam," as well as for the word "Man" as in "Man[kind]." Hence "Ab Adm" literally translated is "Father Adam," or "Father [of] Man[kind]". It is also interesting in connection with this that the abode of El is described as a place not unlike the biblical *Garden of Eden* — that El had several wives who were related to Him in the same manner that Eve is described in the Bible as being related to Adam: "bone of my bones, and flesh

[60]Gen 2:23

[61]Gen 29:14; Judges 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:12–13; 1 Ch 11:1. See also "President

of my flesh"[60] which is an expression consistently used in the Old Testament to designate blood kinship.[61]

This recent discovery regarding the ancient Semitic God "El" in conjunction with other information, has brought most scholars to acknowledge that the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were polytheists. Even though their loyalties did center in the God El, yet still they acknowledged the existence of other Gods. Indeed, scholars have come to the conclusion that even Moses was polytheistic by modern standards.[62] This is most significant, especially in view of the fact that over a hundred and fifty years ago the Prophet Joseph Smith portrayed the idea in the *Book of Abraham* that the Patriarchs were polytheists[63] — indeed polytheistic, polygamist patriarchs, who worshiped a polytheistic, polygamist, patriarchal God — a Divine being whom they thought of as "God the Father" and to whom they referred as "Father Adam" — "The Father of the Gods" and "The Father of Mankind" — not in the sense that he created them out of mud like an adobe, but through the power of procreation!

Startling as this revelation may be, yet it is only as it were the beginning of our discovery, for there were also concepts of a preexistence and a spirit creation associated with El worship. Human sacrifices as in the case of Abraham and Isaac and Jesus also seemed to have a place therein.[64] Not only so, but *Kings and Priests* were anointed[65] and every year on New Year's Day there was a ceremony celebrated which had incredible parallels, both in symbolism and content to the Temple ceremony which God revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith at Nauvoo.[66] Basically speaking, El played the same role in these ancient ceremonies as Michael or Adam does in the Endowment ceremony that is acted out in modern LDS temples today. The tradition was that

---

Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity, an Organized Collection of His Own Statements", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol 8: <Sept 1987> 42.

[62]Eerdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 5:519; *The Interpreters Bible* 1:361

[63]Abraham Chapts. 3–5

[64] *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible states the following:*

"The ancient Semites believed the first-born belonged to the deity and were

the honor of personifying El[67] would be given to the local King of

---

to be sacrificed to him. The Hebrews related this offering to the exodus event. Within the family and tribal spheres a certain preferential status, preciousness, sanctity, authority, sovereignty, responsibility, and right of succession accrued to the first-born. In a figurative sense the term was applied to Israel, the king, the Messiah, *and in the New Testament* ***to Jesus***. . . .

"**Right of the first-born.** The term "first-born" is used predominantly in the Old Testament to designate the eldest son (e.g., Gen. 10:15; 22:21; Exod. 6:14; Num. 3:2; "eldest," in Gen. 44:12; 1 Sam. 17:28). While the prerogatives of the first-born are basically those of sanctity, the emphasis on ancestry, family, and inheritance among the Hebrews gave a special distinction to the first-born son. As the first strength of the father, he became the next head of the family (or clan or tribe), and embodied the soul and character of the social group, becoming responsible for its continuance and welfare. As such he acted with a certain authority, felt a greater responsibility (Gen. 37:22), and received a preferential treatment (Gen. 43:33). As his BIRTHRIGHT he had claims on the family BLESSING (Gen. 27:1–4, 35–37) and received a double portion of the family inheritance (Deut. 21:17) . . . . .

"**Offering of firstlings.** From pre-Canaanite days, Israel acknowledged the first-born to belong to God (Exod. 13:1–2; 22:29–30; 34:19–20) as Head of the Tribe or Giver of Fertility — later, no doubt, as Lord of the Land (Pss. 24:1; 50:10, 12). The firstlings of domestic animals were offered to the deity at the spring pastoral festival (at the yeaning period) by a sacrifice and communal meal. The first-born possessed a peculiar sanctity and efficacy, and, when offered to the deity, guaranteed the fertility and continuity of the flock or herd, and released the remainder from taboo so they could be appropriated. . . .

"**Human Sacrifice.** *How the first-born of man was offered to Yahweh* ***is not certain*** *— on occasion,* ***perhaps****, as a sacrifice*. Human sacrifice does not seem to have been unknown, or especially revolting, to Israel in the early days (Gen. 22:2–3; Judg. 11:34–39; 2 Sam 21:9; Ezek 20:26). But the practice does not seem to have been widespread and was soon abandoned (Gen. 22, which vindicates the substitution of a ram for human first-born; see also Exod. 13:13, 15; 34:20). *It is quite possible many first-born sons were devoted to the Lord* ***for service as priests****,* before there was an ordered priesthood (1 Sam 1:11, 22).

*"In the law codes of Israel, first-born sons* ***were to be redeemed*** — originally, perhaps, by a ram (Gen. 22:9–13) (*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2:270–271)

*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* states the following:

"**Some** of the early Semitic tribes believed that the first-born belonged to the deity and had to be offered up sacrificially. . . . Thus the narrative of the Moabite war records that Mesha sacrificed the heir to the throne to Chemosh, the national

god (2 K 3:27). This barbarous custom must have become extinct at an early period in the religion of Israel (Gen 22:12). . . . .

***Already*** *in the patriarchal period* a ram was deemed *an acceptable sacrificial* ***substitute*** *for the first-born* (Gen 22:13), but at the time of the Exodus God renewed His claim to the first-born of humans and animals (Ex 13:1–16). (*ISBE* 2:308)

The following information is taken from the dust jacket of this Encyclopedia:

"First published in 1915, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* has long been considered a standard among biblical reference works. And now, after more than fifteen years of extensive rewriting and careful editing, the first revision of this classic work since 1929 is available. Combining the defining function of a dictionary with the encyclopedia's presentation of comprehensive information, the revised *ISBE* summarizes the state of knowledge about each of its topics and leads the reader to further sources of information and insight. . . . . This work represents the scholarship of hundreds of contributors from many specialized fields of biblical research." *ISBE* was published by William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company in 1988. Erdmans is a "Christian" publishing house.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* states the following:

"Owing to his favored status, the firstborn was considered the most desirable sacrifice to a deity where human sacrifice was practiced. . . . In a prophetic passage, the sacrifice of the firstborn is singled out as that offering which might be supposed the most efficacious for expiation (Micah 6:7). The importance of the *beknor* is dramatized in the saga of the ten plagues God inflicted upon the Egyptians, the last of which struck down their firstborn (e.g. Ex. 11:5; 12:12). This serves as the etiology of the legal-cultic requirement that *the male firstborn of man and beast in Israel were to be* ***devoted to God***. The Lord acquired title to Israel's firstborn, human and animal, by having spared them when he struck the firstborn of the Egyptians (Num 3:13)." (*Encyclopaedia Judaica* 6:1308)

In view of all this, the self-evident meaning of Old Testament Passages such as the following comes into sharp focus:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine. . . . . thou shalt set apart unto Yahweh all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast; the male shall be Yahweh's. And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck: and *all the firstborn of man among thy children* ***shalt thou redeem***." (Exodus 13:1–2, 12–13)

That human sacrifice ***in one form or another*** formed a part of ancient El religion is well established, not only from the incident with Abraham and Isaac, and then later with Jesus, but also from the discoveries made at Carthage, in northern Africa, where a sacrificial shrine to El has been unearthed by archaeologists.

Carthage was an ancient city/republic which was founded in the 9th century B.C.E. by a Phenico-Semitic people from Tyre and Sidon. Bearing in mind that El worship was the principle religion of Carthage, the following 3rd century A.D. statement from the Jewish "Talmud" is most significant:

"From Tyrus to Carthage Israel and his ***'Father in heaven'*** are known; from Tyrus to the west and from Carthage to the east Israel and his God are not known" (Men., 110a). (*The Jewish Encyclopedia* 3:594; see also *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 5:214–215)

In view of this statement about Israel's ***'Father in Heaven'*** being known in Carthage, it is most significant that a large sacrificial image built to El was found there. This image was shaped in such a way that the arms of El were brought together to form a slippery slide which led down into the pit of a fiery furnace, and the remains of human sacrifices were found in its bottom.

It is likely that in Ancient Israel, there were times when criminals, who had received the death sentence, were offered up as a sacrifice or Blood Atonement for their sins (Gen 9:6), and this too, in a manner not unlike that at Carthage. Indeed, this is the very picture which is portrayed in the 73th Psalm. Consider the following:

"Truly God is good to Israel, *even to such as are of* ***a clean heart***. But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. . . . They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Therefore *pride compasseth them about* as a chain; ***violence*** *covereth them as a garment*. . . . They scoff and *speak with* ***malice***; they *threaten* ***oppression***. They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth. . . . And they say, How doth El know [about my sins]? and is there knowledge [concerning my corruption] in Elyon? Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches. . . . When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me; *Until I went into the* ***sanctuary of El***, *then understood I their end*. Surely thou didst set them in ***slippery places****: thou* ***castedst them down*** *into* ***destruction***. How are they brought into *desolation*, ***as in a moment!*** they are ***utterly consumed*** with terrors." (KJV, RSV, Psalms 73:1–20)

It is interesting that some of the newer translations, including the *Anchor Bible* and the *Jerusalem Bible* have totally obscured this passage — no doubt because the whole idea is so revolting. In our sterilized society it is difficult to comprehend the real world of the ancients. If we want a chicken to eat, all we need do is go down to the local supermarket and buy some bird all neatly wrapped in cellophane — but in the world of the ancients, they must first go out and cut off its head and then gut and dress it for dinner. We are so far from the world of reality that it is difficult for us to comprehend that the glass of milk we drink every morning comes from some dirty cow who spends its whole day out in the barnyard, trouncing around in its own dung. Our world is so clean and neat that if a woman does not want her

child, all she need do is go see her doctor and apply for a legalized, government sponsored abortion. The physician hooks his patient up and sucks the miniature human being out of its mother's womb with a vacuum hose, when it lands with a splat in some trash bag ready for disposal. The operation is so clean and neat that it is little more bother or inconvenience than going to the bathroom — it is as though the miniature child never was. Neither the Doctor or mother need even so much as look at the human waste left behind — hence no guilt and no need to acknowledge that they have just murdered a defenseless infant human being.

The ancients offered up human sacrifices and for this they are barbaric and revolting, but in accordance with modern law and practice, millions who live in this great age of enlightenment murder their own offspring, and this goes on every day — indeed, hundreds of thousands of abortions are preformed every year. Let us read what the ancient barbaric Assyrian's wrote in their law code regarding women who were guilty of deliberately bringing on an abortion:

"If a woman of her own accord drops that which is in her [i.e. if she deliberately aborts her child], they shall prosecute her, convict her, impale her, (and) not bury her. If she dies from dropping that which is in her, they shall impale her (and) not bury her." (*The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* <first Phoenix Edition 1963> by Alexander Heidel, p. 155)

Ancient King David was condemned by God for committing adultery and for the murder of one man, but in our day such a thing would be small business. Hitler murdered 7 million Jews — and when Communism was spread to China, Mao murdered 40 million Chinese. Stalin murdered 22 million of his own countrymen and for this they made him a hero. What's more he did it with American backing, for the Bolshevik Revolution was financed out of New York by the Rockefellers.

We of this modern generation are so good and so neat and clean! Anciently a man had to look his enemy in the face before he killed him — but in our day we have found a better way of doing business. At the push of a button we can murder millions — and those who do the act don't even need to be present to look into the faces of the dead and dying! Oh truly, how neat and clean we are! In our wonderful world of modern technology we think we are better and more refined than our ancient ancestors. The truth is, *we ought to be better, but instead we are worse* — greater wickedness and hypocrisy never existed on Earth than it does today — not even in old Sodom and Gomorrah!

We can be sure that life meant every bit as much to the ancients as it does to us today, and when by command of God, Abraham went out to offer up *his only son*, we can be sure that he did so with sobs and tears of sorrow.

No doubt, as with other doctrines and principles in the old religion of the Patriarchs, so also in the case of sacrifice — ***in many respects it became corrupt***. Some of the sources which are cited above suggest that prior to the time of Abraham, the people of God offered up their firstborn children as a sacrifice. Actually though, there is no evidence to indicate that any of the early Patriarchs offered

up their children as a sacrifice, but on the contrary, those who received the "Right of the Firstborn" were to be devoted to God ***in the Service of the Priest-hood***. In Genesis it is made clear that even as early as the time of Adam the Lord expected His people to redeem their Firstborn sons through the offering of a lamb. This is clearly shown to be the case in Abel's sacrifice, as well as that of Noah (Gen 4:4; 8:20–21). The one exception to this would be Terah, who apostatized from the true religion, and attempted to offer up his son Abraham to a false God (Abraham 1:5–21). This is all the more astonishing when considered in light of what God later required of Abraham in the offering of his only son Isaac. Yet all this notwithstanding, if we are to believe in the religion of the New Testament, of necessity we must also believe that *Human Sacrifice* was in very deed a part of the divine plan. The prophetic picture of a future Messiah, and the "Atonement" which he would make for our sins is clearly foretold throughout the Old Testament, and these prophecies received a literal fulfillment in the Blood Atonement of Jesus Christ. Indeed, the Book of Moses makes it clear that animal sacrifice was revealed at the time of Adam and that it was commanded by God as a similitude foreshadowing the future Atonement of Christ, the Divine Firstborn Son of God:

And Adam and Eve, his wife, called upon the name of the Lord, and they heard the voice of the Lord from the way toward the Garden of Eden, speaking unto them, and they saw him not; for they were shut out from his presence. And he gave unto them commandments, that they should worship the Lord their God, *and should* ***offer the firstlings of their flocks****, for an offering unto the Lord*. And Adam was obedient unto the commandments of the Lord. And after many days an angel of the Lord appeared unto Adam, saying: Why dost thou offer sacrifices unto the Lord? And Adam said unto him: I know not, save the Lord commanded me. And then the angel spake, saying: This thing is ***a similitude*** *of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father,* which is full of grace and truth. (Moses 5:4–7)

Surely had God Almighty wanted to do so, He might have made other plans — He could have made it any way he pleased — certainly he has the power. Yet history has positively demonstrated that the plan which He excepted was for His chosen Son, even His "Firstborn", to come down on Earth and be offered up in a most bloody manner as a Human Sacrifice for sin — "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God", and that through his "stripes" we might be healed (1 Peter 3:18; Isa 53:5).

In keeping with tradition, we can sing with praise about the "Atonement" of Jesus every week in Church. But when we do so, we ought to be cognizant of the fact that we are singing about a "Human Sacrifice", and that from just such crude ideas as those which we are discussing here came the New Testament religion of Jesus Christ — the Divine Son of El, who came down on Earth for the express purpose of being offered up as a Sacrifice for the sins of the people. We ought to be cognizant of the fact that Human Sacrifice is exactly what it is, and that however glorious it may appear to us today, at the time of the execution, Jesus

the City-State in which the ceremony was celebrated — just as today a local Priesthood head is given the honor of personifying Adam in LDS Temples. Scholars have come to recognize that it is this very ceremony that Ezekiel speaks of as he mocks the King of Tyre for sitting in the seat of El, as though he were God:

---

actually felt the pain and the agony when the nails were driven into his flesh and he was hung upon a cross to suffer and bleed and die — it was indeed a bloody affair — a Human Sacrifice!

In the end Jesus himself shrank back, and pled with his Father, that if it be possible, the cup might be passed from him — nevertheless, he prayed, "not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). Finally, in the end, in the agony of his soul, he cried out from the cross — "my El, my El why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt 27:46; Mark 15:34) And then after crying out again, he yielded up the Ghost and died.

We have the option of believing that God was hard and past feeling and that He did not care — or we can believe as it is said in the Gospel of John, that "God so loved the world, that He gave his Only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16)

In all this we must not forget that in accordance with the divine plan, it was intended that this world would be a time of sickness and sorrow, and of death and pain (Gen 3:16–19). And neither ought we to forget that God's perspective on Life, Mortality and Eternity is considerably broader than our own, and it is only through this broader perspective that He has given us such passages as that found in 2 Nephi 2:11–29. For more on sacrifice see *Zondervan's Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* 5:198; *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 1:248; *The History of Ancient Israel* (1984) by Michael Grant, 25.

[65]Genesis Chapter 14:18 states that Melchizedek was a Priest/King. See also Heb. 7:1–2. Revelations 1:6 states that Jesus had washed the faithful Saints from their sins in his own blood, "And hath made us *kings and priests* unto God and his Father" (Rev 1:6) The vision given to the Prophet Joseph Smith in 1832 intimated that the same practice would be had among the Latter-day Saints (D&C 76:56–58). Finally ten years later, on May 4th 1842 the ritualistic practice of anointing Kings and Priests was formally initiated in the Endowment Ceremony (*History of the Church* 5:1–2. For a comprehensive discussion on this see *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol 3: <Dec. 1986> 18 –29.

[66]The fact that the Temple Ceremony as revealed by the Prophet contains a sacred Prayer which is addressed directly to "El", is to say the least, interesting. This is especially so when you consider the entire lack of information regarding El and His character and Attributes as of the time the ceremony was revealed in 1842, and when it was finally recorded in 1877.

During the last ten years, some anti-Mormons have claimed that this prayer

Thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am El, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not El, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God. . . . . Thou hast been in *Eden the garden of God;* (Ezek 28:2, 13)

These ceremonies are known among scholars as the "Royal Man" and "Coronation" rites, and they were celebrated in all of the great civilizations throughout the ancient Near East — at Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria and in the Phoenician city states of Canaan, at Sidon, Tyre and Ugarit and even at Jerusalem during the time of Melchizedek. Many scholars even believe that they were celebrated in Solomon's Temple.[68] What is most significant in the above passage from Ezekiel is that it preserves a *variant tradition* of the *Garden of Eden* from that which has been handed down to us in Genesis.[69] The important point for us to recognize here is that it portrays El as though He were Adam in the Garden of Eden, and in keeping with this, some scholars have come to the conclusion that El "fell". As the *Interpreter's Commentary of the Bible* states it:

Forms of the Eden story, other than those preserved in Genesis, are reflected here [i.e. Ezekiel 28:11–19]. **Eden, the garden of God** (vs 13; cf 31:8–9, 16) as **the holy mountain of God** (vs. 14) is consonant with the concept of Eden as the abode of the Deity, and so an idealized or cosmic sanctuary or high place with its sacred trees and streams (see 47:1–12). Eden as the source of the rivers in Gen. 2:10–14 may presume the mountain-of-God

was actually addressed to Satan — however an examination of *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (which was first published in 1890) will reveal that this is not the case. In the ceremony, as recorded by President Young, the Prayer is addressed to "God" via the name of "Ale". According to Strong, as of 100 years ago, the proper pronunciation for "El" was thought to be "Ale":

"'**el**, ale; short. from 352; *strength*; as adjective *mighty*; especially the *Almighty* . . . God" (*Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary, p. 12, word number 410)

[67]*The Son Of Man In Myth And History*, by Frederick Houk Borsch, 55 – 167.

[68]*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2:415

[69]In other words the Genesis story as it is presently had in the Bible has been altered and doctored by ancient Judaism in order to do away with polytheism. That this is so is considered as a fact by the great majority of scholars whether they be from the Jewish or Christian camp. Consider the following statement from the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*:

concept, and recalls the Ugaritic myth that in the "heights of the north" El dwells "at the sources of the two rivers in the midst of the streams of the two deeps" (*mbk nhrm qrb apq thmtm*; see Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook*, text 49, 1, ll. 5–6; text 51, IV, ll. 21–22; text 2 Aqht, VI, ll 47–48; ect.) The figure is that of the first man in Eden. He was created perfect in beauty and wisdom, and dressed in the splendor of precious stones. When guilt was discovered in him, he was driven by the cherub from Eden (cf Gen. 3:24). (*The Interpreter's Bible* Vol. 6:219–220, emphasis in original)

During the celebration of these "Royal Man" and "Coronation rites", a form of baptism by immersion was practiced, and even though it was not thought of in the precise manner as it is today, still it involved concepts which have an incredible likeness to statements made about baptism by Jesus and Paul.[70] Indeed, even the original meaning for the Greek word, which is used throughout the New Testament for baptism, clearly portrays this original understanding.[71]

## OLD TESTAMENT USAGE

"The publication of Deuteronomy in 621 B.C. marks substantially the end of the old religion of Israel and the beginning of Judaism, the death of a national religion and the birth of an ethical religion of salvation for all men. The immediate effect of the teaching of this book was the reformation of Josiah (2 Kings 23:4–23) — Canaanite and Assyrian cult objects were removed from the temple; all shrines of Jehovah, with the sole exception of the temple in Jerusalem, were destroyed; all sanctuaries dedicated to foreign gods were annihilated. . . . .

"After 621 B.C. it was necessary to rewrite the history of Israel in the spirit and style of Deuteronomy. The existing stories from Abraham to the death of David were national epics, not religious tracts with historical illustrations in which the prophetic denunciation of sin was pervasive. The first edition of Kings, published ca. 600 B.C. denounces the pre-Deuteronomic years (with rare exceptions) as culpable defections of the law of Moses, particularly because the "high places" (village shrines of Jehovah) were not removed according to Deut. 12. Half a century later the books from Genesis to Kings were submitted to a Deuteronomistic retouching, which is pervasive in Joshua and supplies introductions and conclusions to the stories of Judges; the philosophy of history of these editors is plainly described in Judges 2:6–3:6." (*The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* 1:503–504)

For more on this see "The Common Origin of Ancient Hebrew/Pagan Religion and the Demise of the Hebrew Goddess", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 8: <Feb 1991> 7, footnote 9, p. 14, footnote 21, p. 28, footnote 56, p. 28.

[70]Anciently it was believed that Leviathan, the seven headed dragon (who in the New Testament is identified with Satan Rev 12:3; 13:1; 17:3, 7; Job 41:1; Ps

## OF
## EL, EL ELYON, ELYON, EL SHADDAI AND SHADDAI

The two most common names used for El in the Old Testament are El Elyon and El Shaddai. "El Elyon" and "Elyon" is translated into the English as "The Highest", "The Most High", "God Most High", or "The Most High God" and "El Shaddai" is translated as "God Almighty" and "Almighty God". It is interesting that in the Book of Psalms the title El occurs by itself seventy seven times. Elyon or Most High is used all of eighteen times, while Shaddai is used only twice. In Job however, it is the other way around — El occurs by itself fifty five times and Shaddai is used thirty one times, but Elyon is not even used once. In Daniel El occurs by itself four times, Elyon is used twelve times, and "The Ancient of Days" three times, but Shaddai is not used at all.

### — THE BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF EL —

The story of El worship in the Bible commences in Genesis Chapter 14 where Abraham meets Melchizedek after returning from the slaughter of the Kings.[72] The word "El" is there found for the first time in the Bible, in connection with the lofty title of Melchizedek's calling as "Priest of the Most High God". The original Hebrew reads "El Elyon", which precisely translated reads "El Most High", but whether the title is rendered in its Hebrew or English

---

74:14; 104:26; Isa 27:1) lived in the depths of the sea — hence the sea was the domain of Satan. Baptism by immersion was seen as a covenant symbolical of birth in mortality (Moses 6:59) wherein the recipient willingly agrees by sacred covenant to descend down into the depths of the sea for the purpose of doing battle with Satan. This battle is against great odds and there is no real chance for victory. Nevertheless the disciple covenants to be valiant in battle to the very end, when he will finally be over come in death, and be drowned in the depths of the sea — hence baptism by immersion. Yet this defeat is only temporary, for presently the valiant soldier is miraculously restored to life with power to rise from his watery tomb — indeed, having descended below all things, he now has power to rise above all things — even death, hell and the grave!

[71] *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* 1:143–153.

[72] Gen 14:18–20, 22

[73] *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (1982) Vol. 2:506; *Theological*

form, it nonetheless carries with it an obvious ring of polytheism. It clearly suggests the rank of the "Highest" deity[73] and in so doing, the existence of other lesser or subservient gods is suggested. Perhaps one of the clearest examples of this is found in the 97th Psalm where Yahweh is declared to be Elyon or the Most High, who is "the Grand One" "high above all [other] gods."

> You are Yahweh Most High over the world, far transcending all other gods. (Jerusalem Bible, Psa 97:9; see also the *Anchor Bible*, Vol. 17 page 360)

In commenting upon the title Elyon as a name for God *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* states the following:

> El Elyon . . . This name, or simply elyon (. . . "Exalted One," "Most High"), in Canaanite usage was a title for the Exalted One, the highest god of the pantheon, El. The Canaanite background of the title is illustrated by the story in Gen. 14 which reflects the Jerusalem cultus in pre-Israelite times. Melchizedek, priest of El Elyon, blesses Abr(ah)am in the name of this God, whom he praises as "maker [or possessor] of heaven and earth" (vss. 18–20). The polytheistic associations of the name have been refined from the biblical story, for Abraham hastens to identify El Elyon with Yahweh (vss. 22). Likewise in the oracles of Balaam three Canaanite words for "deity — "El," "Shaddai," and "Elyon" — are grouped together (Num. 24:16). In these and other instances "Elyon" changed its meaning by becoming a synonym for "Yahweh" (Deut. 32:8–9; II Sam. 22:14; Pss. 7:17—H 7:18; 9:2—H 9:3; 21:7—H 21:8; 46:4—H 46:5; 91:1, 9; etc.). At times there seems to be a faint echo of the old polytheistic meaning (cf. Ps. 97:9), but in Israel's faith this language referred to the heavenly council, within which Yahweh rules over the divine beings ( . . . cf. Pss. 29:1; 82:1, 6; 89:6—H 89:7) who serve him. (*The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible* 2:412)

---

*Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1:256. Herbert Lockyer in His book *All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible* (1975) in commenting upon the meaning of the name/title "Elyon" explains that "Highest" as used in this title makes reference to Gods "ascendancy over all others" (*ADN* . . . 248)

[74] Gen 14:19, 22

[75] *The Jerusalem Bible*, Gen 14:19, 22; see also *Anchor Bible*, Gen 14:19, 22

In Genesis 14 the King James translation appends an epithet to El's name, proclaiming Him "Possessor of Heaven and Earth",[74] but this is not in accordance with the original Hebrew. In some of the newer translations, a more accurate rendering is given and "El Elyon" is rightly declared to be the "Creator of Heaven and Earth".[75] This is in keeping with what has been discovered at Ugarit where El is designated as "the Creator of the Created Things" and "El the Creator of the Earth".[76] It is also in keeping with the role which is played by Michael or Adam in the creation, as depicted in the Endowment Ceremony in LDS Temples.

As has already been mentioned, El had many wives, and they all bore Him Children, but his first wife was Asherah, and we learn in Genesis chapter 21, that Abraham offered worship to her as a Mother Goddess in conjunction with the Father God El.[77] In accordance with what has been found at Ugarit, Asherah was with El in primordial times, before the creation of Earth and it was there that she bore him 70 sons and many daughters and a numerous "Host" besides — even all the "Host of Heaven and Earth".[78]

For some reason Seventy of El's sons were given special status and they sat next to Him in the "Grand Council." It was these sons in connection with all their brothers and sisters, with El and Asherah standing at their head, that composed the pantheon or the Divine assembly of the gods who sat in the Heavenly Council before creation. At early times in Israel, these divine beings were thought of as gods who occupied a subordinate position to Yahweh/El,

---

[76] *The Conflict Between El And Baal In Canaanite Religion*, by Ulf Oldenburg, p. 16; also Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* Vol. 1:245.

[77] Gen 21:33; Deut 16:21; *The Hebrew Goddess,* by Raphael Patai, p. 12–41; *Encyclopedia Judiaca* 8:1227; 3:703–706; *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* 1:250–252. For more on this see: "The Demise of the Hebrew Goddess and the Common Origin of Ancient Hebrew/Pagan Religion", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol 8: <Feb 1991> No. 2.

[78] Gen 2:1; *The Conflict Between El And Baal In Canaanite Religion*, by Oldenburg, pp. 17–19, 28; *TDOT* 1:253.

but later, when the influence of philosophic monotheism began to make itself felt, all the sons and daughters of El were relegated to a semi divine status as angels.[79] Erdman's *Theological Dictionary Of The Old Testament* offers us the following commentary on this subject:

The nature of Mosaic monotheism is often misconstrued as insisting that Yahweh is the only god in existence. This notion is foreign to the earliest Old Testament materials. There are other gods, who fall into two categories: *those who work for Yahweh (and appear later as angels) and those who oppose him*. All these figures derive from pre-Mosaic Yahwistic mythology. Mention of these groups is most common in old [Testament] poetry [especially in the Book of Job and Psalms].

Yahweh's subordinates are the members of the sod-q dosim, "the council of the holy ones" (Ps. 89:8[7]; cf. also the ideologically "later"

---

[79]Perhaps one of the clearest examples of this is found in Psalms chapter 8, verses 4 through 6. The King James translation gives us the following reading:

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him *a little lower than the angels*, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet (Psa 8:4–6)

The King James rendering of this passage is based on the Septuagint which is a third century B.C. Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. The work of translation was done by 70 Jewish scholars, hence its name "Septuagint" which in Greek means 70. As of this time, the Greeks had already conquered Judaea, and the Jewish culture and religion was experiencing a tremendous influence from their Greek captors. This influence is clearly visible in the translation of the Septuagint. Greek philosophers were beginning to conceive of God in abstract terms, and the hard core anthropomorphism or more properly expressed, theomorphism, which was to be found throughout the Old Testament was under attack and ridicule. (For details on this see: *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God II Essays in Anthropomorphism*, by A. Marmorstein, Ph.D., Rabbi, published by Ktav Publishing House, Inc. New York, first published in 1937, pp. 1–56) Evidently a large portion of the Seventy translators were influenced by this, and consequently many of the Biblical anthropomorphisms were either softened or altogether removed from the text (See *The Septuagint Translation Of The Hebrew Terms In Relation To God In The book Of Jeremiah*, <1981> by Bernard M. Ziotowitz). In the case of the passage quoted above, the original Hebrew word for English "angels" was "eloheim", which actually means "gods" and is properly translated as "God" or "gods". However, in this case the translators elected to demote the gods to the

passages Ps. 35:10; 71:19; 89:9[8]; 1 K. 8:23 par. 2 Ch. 6:14; also Dt. 10:17; Ps. 136:2). They surround him as he moves (Dt. 33:2f.; Zec. 14:5). His superiority is obvious: "Who is like you, Yahweh, among the gods? Who is like you, awesome one, among the holy ones?" (Ex. 15:11; cf. Ps. 89:6–8[5–7]).

The motif of the divine council, although usually associated in the Old Testament with Yahweh, *is the result of Yahweh's fusion with El*. The council of El, well known from Ugaritic texts, appears in its original form only once in the Old Testament, namely in Dt. 32:8f., where the *primordial* apportioning of the inheritance of El's sons is described. (*TDOT* 5:519–520)

In accordance with early Hebrew thought, all the gods of the pantheon met together in a primordial council, for the purpose of dividing up the peoples of earth into seventy different nations. This

---

semi-divine status of angels. In many of the modern translations, this has been corrected so as to read more in accordance with the original Hebrew. Consider for example the following:

The Jerusalem Bible:

what is man that you should spare a thought for him, the son of man that you should care for him? Yet you have made him little less than a god (Psalms 8:4–6)

Anchor Bible:

What is man that you should think of him, or the son of man that you should care for him? Yet you have made him a little less than the gods (Psalms 8:5–6)

Revised Standard Version:

what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou dost care for him? Yet thou hast made him little less than God (Psalms 8:4–5)

New American Standard Bible:

What is man, that Thou dost take thought of him? And the son of man, that Thou dost care for him? Yet Thou hast made him a little lower than God (Psalms 8:4–5)

New International Version:

what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him? You made him a little lower than the heavenly beings[f] [note [f]: Or than God] (Psalms 8:4–5)

For more on this see the *Anchor Bible*, Job p. 9; *The Interpreter's Bible* 4:442–443.

was all done in basic accord with Genesis chapter 10,[80] and each of El's seventy sons was given dominion as a God over one of the nations. For some reason, Israel, and the Land of Canaan remained under the especial providence of El and His favored son "Yahweh", who in accordance with prophecy was destined to be born on Earth as the Messiah. This early doctrine is clearly reflected in some of the newer translations of the Bible. Consider the following:

When Elyon assigned the nations their inheritance, when he divided up humankind, he set up the peoples' territories according to the number of El's sons; Yahweh's portion was his people, Jacob was his hereditary share.[81] (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Vol 5:19–20; see also *The Interpreters Bible* Vol 1:360; Vol 2:519; *The Jerusalem Bible,* Deut. 32:8; *The Anchor Bible,* Deut. 32:8)

You will notice it states that Elyon "divided up humankind" into "territories" or different nations and that he did so according to the number of His sons. This is a reference to his 70 favored sons which Asherah bore in primordial times. So one nation was given to each of El's 70 sons, and thereafter that son would be god to that nation. In keeping with this Old Testament doctrine, most of the sons of El (that is those who possessed high status in the pantheon) were identified with and designated by one of the celestial bodies. In other words, each of El's sons and daughters would be identified with a particular star — the Sun, the Moon, or one of the planets or stars, and thereafter, that particular star would take upon

---

[80] *Encyclopedia Judiaca* 12:882–886; William Foxwell Albright <*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan a Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths* 1968> 192.

[81] See note 58. In this passage it is stated that Yahweh is the Son of El Elyon (for more on this see Mark S. Smith <*The Early History of God* 1990> 7, 18, 22). Some of the Ugaritic texts also speak of a son of El named Yaw. One of the texts reads:

> And Ltpn [i.e. El], God of Mercy, replies: [ ]
> "The name of my son is Yw-El . . .

In commenting upon this passage, Cyrus H. Gordon makes the following statement:

"Yw-El" is the son of the head of the pantheon. This suggests that "Yahweh" ("Yw") was originally El's son in pre-Israelite Canaan. It is usual for a younger god to eclipse the older gods in the development of religion. In other words, just as Zeus eclipsed his father Cronus, Yahweh eclipsed his father El. Subsequently,

itself the deity's name, whom it personified. Accordingly, each of the Seventy Nations would worship one of the Celestial bodies

---

Hebrew monotheism necessitated the identification of Yahweh with El.

Elsewhere in the same book, Gordon writes:

The occurrence in a Ugaritic text of *Yw-il* as El's son has stirred up some understandable controversy. But the text is clear and the reading makes sense. The form *Yaw-* or *Yø* occurs early for "Yahweh." <It is embedded in the name of Moses' mother, "Jochebed" (written *Yw-kbd* in Hebrew), and must therefore be pre-Mosaic in Israel.> With *-il* added, it is exactly the Hebrew name *Yø-el*, "Joel." That development, whereby a son-god becomes the great God, should not surprise anyone acquainted with the history of religion. Israel's monotheism is the more remarkable because of its pagan antecedents. By identifying a particular god (Yaw- or Yahweh) with the head of the pantheon (El), and equating him with the principle of godhood (Elohim), the Hebrews arrived at the monotheism that has taken root in Western civilization.

In yet another place in the same book, Gordon writes:

Double names of deities are exceedingly common in the ancient Near East, e.g., Yahweh-Elohim in the Bible, and Amon-Re in Egypt. The notion that Yahweh-Elohim results from fusing two documents (a "J" document with Jehovah/Yahweh, and an "E" document with Elohim) completely misses the mark. (Cyrus H. Gordon <*Ugarit and Minoan Crete the Bearing of their Texts on the Origins of Western Culture* 1966> 61 note 25; 24–25; 58 note 23)

Today many scholars believe the above text (i.e. "The name of my son is Yw-El ) to be a reference to Old Testament Yahweh. As we shall see, there are also several passages in the gospels of Mark and Luke, which proclaim Christ the Messiah to be the Son of El Elyon, and several others which identify Christ as Yahweh. At the same time, there are other passages (indeed, many of them) which identify the Father God as Yahweh, while Christ is prophetically referred to in various titles, such as "the Messiah", Yahweh's "Son" and His "Prophet" or "servant".

It is this apparent inconsistency in the use of the Divine name "Yahweh", together with the world wide traditional insistence on Biblical Monotheism, that has led to considerable confusion and discord among the various sects of Christianity.

For an extensive treatment on the Biblical use of the divine name Yahweh as a name/title for both God the Father and God the Son: see "The Father and the Son, the Two Gods of the Old Testament", by Fred C. Collier, *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 12: <April 1995> No. 4.

Cyrus Herzel Gordon (1908– ) U.S. Semitic scholar. Born in Philadelphia, Gordon worked as a field-archaeologist in Jerusalem and Baghdad from 1931 to 1935, after which he taught Semitics at John Hopkins University (1935–38),

as a personification of the particular son of El whom they were assigned to worship in the primordial council. And so the whole ancient world worshiped the Sun, the Moon, the planets and the stars.[82] But Israel was denied this privilege, for El's son Yahweh had elected her as his especial possession, and it was forbidden by His Law to personify Him with the Sun, or Moon or any star.[83] Moreover, Yahweh was a jealous God, and He would be satisfied with nothing less than Israel's absolute devotion. Nonetheless, the children of Israel were wayward, and they did worship the gods of other nations and for this Yahweh condemned them. This is the context of the following passages in Deuteronomy:

And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest *the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven,* shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them, *which Yahweh thy God hath*

---

Bible at Smith College (1938–41) and at Princeton (1939–42), Assyriology and Egyptology at Dropsie College (1946–56), and Near Eastern studies at Brandeis from 1956.

His *Ugaritic Grammar* (1940) and *Ugaritic Handbook* (1947) which revised the grammar and provided transliterated texts and glossaries were pioneer works in the field as were his *Ugaritic Literature* (1949) and later his *Ugaritic Manual* (1955; revised as *Ugaritic Textbook*, 1965).

Gordon's other major contribution has been in "Helleno-Semitics," the comparison of Eastern and Western civilizations, mainly through the study of early Greece and the Ancient Near East. His works on this subject include *Before the Bible* (1962; revised as *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations*, 1965), in which Gordon examines ancient Greek mythology in comparison to the biblical stories. In *Homer and the Bible* (1967) he tried to show the common background of all the East Mediterranean cultures.

* * * * * *

In 1968 Gordon declared that new knowledge about Phoenician word usage had made it likely that a previously rejected Phoenician tablet (found [in America] in 1872) was genuine and that the Phoenicians had gone to America from Ezion-Geber in the 19th year of Hiram, king of Tyre [i.e. 950 B.C.]. [ED.] (*Encyclopedia Judiaca* 7:793–794)

Gordon was the first world class scholar to give credence to the Book of Mormon.

[82]Many Pharaohs and Kings of different nations thought of themselves as Gods who were the primordial sons of "El" or "Atum" (In Egyptian mythology "Atum"

*divided unto all nations* under the whole heaven. (Deut 4:19)

The Jerusalem Bible account of this passage reads as follows:

When you raise your eyes to heaven, when you see the sun, the moon, the stars, all the array of heaven, do not be tempted to worship them and serve them. Yahweh your God has allotted them to all the peoples under heaven, but as for you, Yahweh has taken you, and brought you out from the furnace of iron, from Egypt, to be a people all his own, as you still are today. (Deut 4:19–20)

Deuteronomy, Chapter 29, brings out this same doctrine when it states that Israel:

served other gods, and worshipped them, gods whom they knew not, and *whom he had not given unto them*[84] (Deut 29:26)

*The Jewish Encyclopedia*[85] offers additional information to this subject:

Biblical historiography* presents the theory that God revealed Himself successively to Adam, Noah, Abraham and his descendants, and finally to Moses. Monotheism was thus made known to the human race in general and to Israel in particular from the very beginning. Not ignorance but perverseness led to the recognition of other gods, necessitating the sending of the Prophets to reemphasize the teachings of Moses and the facts of the earlier revelation. *Contrary to this view, the modern critical school regards monotheism as the final outcome of a long process of religious evolution*, basing its hypothesis upon certain data discovered in the Biblical books as well as upon the analogy presented by Israel's historical development to that of other Semitic groups . . . .

The primitive religion of Israel and the God-concept therein attained reflected the common primitive Semitic religious ideas, which, though

---

was the creator God, and the primeval Father of mankind) who had come down on Earth to reign over their people, just as did Jesus. For more on "Atum" see: *The Book of the Dead*, (1960 edition published by "Bell Publishing Company") by E. A. Wallis Budge, pp. 164–165; see also "*Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961) by Samuel Noah Kramer, p. 83.

[83]Deut 32:8–9; 5:8–9; 6:13–15; Exodus 20:3–5

[84]See also Deut 17:3; 32:8. We see from this that the existence of other Gods was not denied — on the contrary, their existence was affirmed, but this notwithstanding still Israel was forbidden to worship them.

modified in Biblical times, and even largely eliminated, have left their traces in the theological doctrines of the Israel of later days. Renan's theory, formulated in his "*Precis et Systeme Compare des Languages Semitiques*" (1859), ascribing to the Semites a monotheistic instinct, has been abandoned because it was found to be in conflict with facts. As far as epigraphic material, traditions, and folk-lore throw light on the question, *the Semites are shown to be* ***of polytheistic leanings***. Astral in character, *primitive Semitic religion deified the sun, the moon, and the other heavenly bodies . . . . .*

The intense tribal consciousness of the Semites, however, wielded from a very early period a decisive influence in the direction of associating with each tribe, sept, or clan a definite god, which the tribe or clan recognized as its own, to the exclusion of others. For the tribe thought itself ***descended from its god***, which it met and entertained at the sacramental meal. With this god it maintained *the blood covenant*.

In continuing, this Jewish source states that:

Equally puzzling is the use of the plural "Elohim" in Hebrew . . . . The interpretation that it is a "pluralis majestatis" with the value of an abstract idea ("the Godhead"), assumes too high a degree of grammatical and philosophical reflection and intention to be applicable to primitive conditions. Traces of an original polytheism might be embodied in it, were it not for the fact that the religion of Israel is the outgrowth of tribal and national ***monolatry**** rather than of polytheism.

*Each tribe in Israel had* ***its tribal god*** . . . . Nevertheless from a very

---

[85]*The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1901–1906) is "A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times, Prepared by More than Four Hundred Scholars and Specialists":

In all directions, the facts of Jewish theology, history, life, and literature remain in a large measure hidden from the world, even from Jews themselves. With the publication of *The Jewish Encyclopedia* a serious attempt is made for the first time to systematize and render generally accessible the knowledge thus far obtained.

That this has now become possible is due to a series of labors carried on throughout the whole of the nineteenth century and representing the efforts of three generations of Jewish scholars, mainly in Germany. (*The Jewish Encyclopedia* Vol 1: Title page, Preface p. vii

[86]*Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8:1045. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1972 — published by Macmillan Company, New York, produced and printed in Jerusalem,

remote period these tribes recognized their affinity to one another by the fact that above their own tribal god they acknowledged allegiance to Yhwh. This Yhwh was the Lord, the Master, the Ruler. His will was regarded as supreme. He revealed Himself in fire or lightning.

In Ex. 6:2 *Yhwh is identified with El-Shaddai, the God of the Patriarchs*. (*The Jewish Encyclopedia* <1901–1906> 6:13)

You will notice that the above quotation states that in accordance with ancient Semitic religion, the Celestial bodies were deified as living beings. Since the publication of the above article at the turn of the century, a great deal of additional information has come to light, such as the discoveries at Ugarit, the Dead Sea Scrolls and many others, all of which only serve to bolster and support the conclusions expressed above. As stated before, in accordance with ancient Semitic thought, the celestial bodies were thought of as gods — they represented the personification of El's sons, and as such they were thought of as living beings. Collectively speaking, they are referred to throughout the New and Old Testament as the "Heavenly Host" — the "Host of Heaven" or the "Stars of El". That this was the understanding both at Ugarit and in Israel is born out from many sources. For example a poem found at Ugarit equates "divine beings" with the "assembly of the stars."[86] Another text reads, "The Sons of El / the assemblage of the stars / the generations of the heavens." In another text, El is referred to as "the King, the Father of Luminaries."[87] This is in keeping with El's New Testament designation as "Father of Lights".[88] One of the newer renderings translates the same passage as the "Father of Luminaries".[89] In the Greek language the plural of "light" designates the "constellations" or "stars", which again are considered as living beings or spirits which were begotten by El.[90] Satan's rebellion in Heaven is described in the Old Testament: "How are thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning", Isaiah asks, and then in answer to the question, Satan is indited:

For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne *above the stars of El,* I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north, I will rival *the Most High* [i.e. Elyon]" (Isaiah 14:12–14, *KJV*; see also *The Jerusalem Bible*)

Another interesting portrayal of the Heavenly Host is found in 1st Kings where "Yahweh" is described "sitting on his throne, and

all the host of Heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left."[91] Bear in mind that it is Israel's early conception of the council of the gods that we are reading about in these passages, for while one passage will equate the Heavenly Host with the stars, another will equate them as the sons of God. We have seen from the above that

---

Israel) is the first Jewish encyclopedia on a major scale to be published for many decades. It represents the culmination of years of intensive work by scholars from many parts of the world and provides a comprehensive picture of all aspects of Jewish life and knowledge up to the present day, intended for both the Jewish and non-Jewish reader.

* * * * * *

For many years, and especially since the cataclysmic events in Jewish history of the 1940s, the need has been felt for an entirely new Jewish encyclopedia, especially in the English language for English-speaking Jewry, who now account for about half of the Jews of the world. Furthermore the survivors of the editorial board of the German *Encyclopaedia Judaica* had always been determined that the Nazi attack on their work could not be accepted as a final defeat and that the unfinished publication must be completed. However, they too recognized that now only a relatively small proportion of the Jewish people had access to a work in German and that any new endeavor in this field must be, first and foremost, in English. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, the last active survivor of the original board of editors, had long had this objective.

Hence in the late 1950s two different programs emerged which eventually coalesced — the completion of the old *Encyclopaedia Judaica* and the publication of a new Jewish encyclopedia in English. At the same time the publishers of the *Encyclopaedia Hebraica* had long held hopes of producing the Judaic portions of their encyclopedia in English. These converging tendencies engendered the practical project to publish the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* in the English language.

Initial funding of the project was made possible through an allocation obtained by Dr. Goldmann from the German reparations fund earmarked for cultural purposes. The Rassco Company in Israel also became interested and provided some of the funds during the early stages. In the U.S. the Encyclopaedia Judaica Research Foundation was established to raise further support for the project.

* * * * * *

Special problems were posed in the Bible Division in view of the greatly varied and even radically opposing attitudes to the Bible and Bible scholarship. It was felt that an encyclopedia designed to reflect all aspects of knowledge relevant to Jewish culture must, in the sphere of Bible, bring to the reader all views — from the most traditional to the most critical. . . . .

The Bible entries have been written and edited by the outstanding scholars in their field and can claim a breadth and comprehension unparalleled in any

Satan is referred to as a "Son of the Morning". Another translation renders it "Daystar, son of dawn"[92] showing clearly that Satan is identified as one of the stars — and in particular, a "morning star". In keeping with this, the book of Job, portrays Satan as a "Wanderer," who one day came Strolling into the Heavenly Council:

> Now there was a day when *the sons of Elohim* came to present themselves before Yahweh, and *Satan came also among them*. And Yahweh said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered Yahweh and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. (Job 1:6–12; see also Job 2:1–7)

In the Old Testament the "sons of God" are equated as "gods" — and gods too that are referred to alternately as the "Heavenly Host" and the "Holy Ones", even "Holy Ghosts." In like manner the "Host of Heaven" are equated as "stars", "angels", and "spirits". In Genesis the "angels of God" are referred to as "God's host".[93] Hence in Job Satan is portrayed as a "Wandering Star" — but in Isaiah he is designated a "son of the morning".[94] At times even mortals are identified with the "Heavenly Host".[95] In the book of Job it is suggested that Job himself preexisted before creation, and that he was

---

encyclopedia other than a specialized biblical one. Traditional approaches and knowledge are combined with the latest scholarship on the Ancient Middle East, its ways of life, its modes of thought, and its languages.

* * * * * *

The preparation of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* has been a labor of devotion and dedication on the part of those responsible. It is the product of intricate work by thousands of participants, many of whom — notably the internal staff and the editors — have made very special efforts and even personal sacrifices to ensure its successful conclusion. (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Introduction, Vol 1:1, 2, 9, 16)

[87]*The Conflict Between El And Baal In Canaanite Religion*, by Ulf Olderburg p. 17

[88]James 1:17

[89]*Anchor Bible* Vol 37, p. 16

[90]*The Conflict Between El And Baal In Canaanite Religion*, by Ulf Oldenburg p. 17

[91]1 Kings 22:19–20

[92]*The Jerusalem Bible,* Isaiah 14:12

[93]Gen 32:1–2

[94]Isa 14:12

[95]*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 1:132–133

numbered among "the morning stars" who sang together when the foundations of the Earth were laid.[96] The same idea is conveyed in Genesis, when the Lord took Abraham outside and told him to "Look up to heaven and count the stars if you can", and then promised Abraham that, "Such will be your descendants."[97] Indeed the Stars personified the spirit sons and daughters of El, who in accordance with the ancient doctrine of the El Religion, were destined to be born on earth as Abraham's posterity.

Again in the New Testament, Jude refers to apostates as "Wandering Stars".[98] In the vision given to Micah the "Host of Heaven" are identified as "spirits".[99] In the gospel of Luke the "Heavenly Host" are equated with "angels".[100] In the book of Revelations, Satan is identified with Leviathan,[101] the seven headed dragon, who in accordance with discoveries at Ugarit, belonged to the El Pantheon.[102] In the same passage, the spirits that followed Satan are designated as the "third part of the Stars of Heaven" — and in like manner, the "Stars of Heaven" are equated as "angels".[103] In Jude, the Host of Satan are designated as "angels which kept not their first estate",[104] and in Second Peter they are referred to as the "angels that sinned."[105] In Acts it was presumed that Peter had died, and what was supposed to be his spirit is referred to as "his angel."[105a] In Psalms 103, "Host" alternates with "angels."[106] In Psalms 148 the "Hosts" are equated with "stars of Light" and "angels". "Praise ye Yahweh" it states:

---

[96]Job 38:3–7. That the doctrine of the premortal existence of man was taught and believed in ancient Israel during the time of the Prophets, as well as during the New Testament period, is well documented in two different articles which were published at the turn of the century in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. One is found under the title "Preexistence" (see Vol. 10:182–184) and the other under the title of "Soul" (see Vol. 11:472–476). Since that time a new update and enlargement of *The Jewish Encyclopedia* has been prepared by Jewish scholars, and finally published in 1972 under the title *Encyclopedia Judiaca*. Yet oddly enough (notwithstanding the discovery of new supportive information which has come from many different directions, including fantastic archaeological discoveries which have been made in our century) the two articles dealing with the premortal existence of man have been deleted from the new publication without either comment or notice.

[97]*The Jerusalem Bible* Gen 15:5; see also Gen 22:17; 26:4

[98]Jude 13. Jude speaks of them as "Wandering Stars, to whom is ***reserved*** the blackness of darkness forever" — evidently, this being a reference to their

Praise ye Yahweh from the heavens: praise him in the heights. Praise ye him, all his *angels*: praise ye him, all his *hosts*. Praise ye him, *sun* and *moon*: praise him, all ye *stars of light*. Praise him, ye heavens of heavens (Psa 148:1–4)

Again, in Isaiah we find the expression "the Stars of El"[107] and in Job the "sons of Elohim".[108] In Numbers El is dubbed as the "God of the spirits of all flesh".[109] In James he is called the "Father of Lights",[110] but in Hebrews he is called "Father of Spirits".[111] In Malachi we find the statement: "Have we not all one father? hath not one El created us?"[112] Again in Deuteronomy in the mist of a discussion on the pre-mortal existence and election of Israel, the question is put to the people, is El not "thy Father that hath brought thee? Hath he not made thee, and established thee?"[113]

We have already learned that in the Old Testament Satan is equated with the Host of Heaven, and that Isaiah identified him as a "son of the Morning", or "Daystar, Son of Dawn". In keeping with this, we learn from the New Testament that Jesus is also equated with the Stars. Indeed, for some reason, the book of Revelations identifies Jesus with a name which is not unlike that of Satan — for therein he is dubed as "the Bright and Morning Star".[113a] Not only so, but

---

foreordained status to a future "Estate" as "sons of Perdition", or the "children of Satan".

[99]1 Kings 22:19–24

[100]Luke 2:13–15

[101]Rev 12:3; 13:1; 17:3, 7; Job 41:1; Psa 74:14; 104:26; Isa 27:1

[102]*The Cuneiform Texts of Rash Shamra — Ugarit* (1939) by Claude F. A. Schaeffer, pp. 65–66; *Ugarit and Minoan Crete . . .* (1966) by Cyrus Gordon pp. 22, 75; *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* 3:108–109.

[103]Rev 12:2–3, 7–9

[104]Jude 6

[105]2 Peter 2:4

[105a]Acts 12:15

[106]Psa 103:20–21

[107]Isa 14:13

[108]Job 1:6; 2:1

[109]Num 16:22; 27:16; see also *TDOT* 1:258

[110]James 1:17

[111]Heb 12:9

[112]Malachi 2:10

[113]Deut 32:6

at his birth certain "Wisemen"[114] from the East saw his star in the Heavens.[115] The Gospel of Luke even records that "a multitude of the heavenly host" appeared and began to praise God saying, "Glory to El Elyon, and on Earth, peace, good will toward men."[116]

If you have not already caught the vision, the one obvious understanding of this allegory is the spirit creation. And herein, the scholars have missed the mark, for they have failed to recognize the metaphorical language of creation. The fact that the divine beings who composed the Heavenly Host preexisted before creation is well attested both in and out of the Bible. And we have seen that the Heavenly host are consistently identified as spirits — and spirits too, who have in some instances entered mortality. Even Satan and his followers are identified with the Heavenly Host, and without a doubt, throughout the Bible they are referred to as evil spirits, or as stated in the book of Psalms, "evil angels".[117]

We learn from Isaiah that the cause of Satan's fall from Heaven was that he sought to exalt himself *"above the stars of El"* and to "rival the Most High."[118] In the book of Revelations we are informed that he gained so much influence that one third of the stars of Heaven followed after him.[119] In 2nd Peter these disobedient spirits are referred to as "the angels that sinned".[120] In keeping with this, the book of Jude refers to Satan and his host as "angels

---

[113a]Rev 22:16

[114]A better understanding of early Greek as accomplished through modern scholarship and archeology has revealed that the more appropriate translation would be "astrologers" rather than "wisemen". This improved understanding is reflected in some of the newer translations. Consider the following:

*Living Bible:*

Jesus was born in the town of Bethlehem, in Judea, during the reign of King Herod. At about that time some astrologers from eastern lands arrived in Jerusalem, asking, "Where is the newborn King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in far-off eastern lands, and have come to worship him. (Matt 2:1–2)

*Today's English Version:*

Soon afterwards some men who studied the stars came from the east to Jerusalem and asked, "Where is the baby born to be the king of the Jews? We saw his star when it came up in the east, and we have come to worship him." (Matt 2:1–2)

*New International Version:*

After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem and asked, "Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews? We saw his star in the east and have come to worship him. (Matt 2:1–2)

*The New Testament in Modern English* by J. B. Phillips:

Jesus was born in Bethlehem, in Judaea, in the days when Herod was king of the province. After his birth there came from the east a party of astrologers making for Jerusalem and enquiring as they went, "Where is the child born to be king of the Jews? For we saw his star in the east and we have come to pay homage to him. (Matt 2:1–2)

*New English Bible:*

Jesus was born at Bethlehem in Judaea during the reign of Herod. After his birth astrologers from the east arrived in Jerusalem, asking, 'Where is the child who is born to be king of the Jews? We observed the rising of his star, and we have come to pay him homage.' (Matt 2:1–2)

*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* states the following: Matthew makes no effort to identify the Magi. He only says that they are from the East, which could mean Arabia, Mesopotamia, or regions beyond. But they know the stars and understand their meaning; this knowledge was a science which was deeply rooted in various peoples of the ancient Orient. In his story of the Magi, Matthew recognizes that the science in this case was right. But he is not the only biblical writer who holds that stars and other heavenly bodies may serve as signs, portents, and wonders revealing God's will. Note Gen. 37:9; Joel 2:28–32; Mark 13:24–27; Acts 2:17–21; Rev. 6:12–17.

While Matthew does not identify the Magi (nor can we), it appears that they have come from far away. They are not Hebrews; their questions indicate this. They are pagans. The wonder, mystery, and reverence of the Magi are tribute to the Messiah from unnamed peoples; and the world's oldest learning pays homage. (*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 3:223)

*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* states the following: The wise men's interest in the Messiah may well have arisen from contact with the Jewish exiles in the east and from knowledge of the Old Testament. Several Old Testament passages foreshadow these events, although Matthew does not mention them. ***The Messiah is a star who will come forth out of Jacob*** (Nu. 24:17); the nations shall come to His light and kings to the brightness of His rising (Isa 60:3). Kings are to come worshiping and bearing gifts (Ps. 68:29 [MT 30]; 72:10–15; Isa. 60:6). The notion that the wise men were kings rests upon an inference from these passages, and that there were three of them rests upon the number of gifts — gold, frankincense, and myrrh. (*ISBE* 4:1085)

which kept not their first estate".[121]

All this brings us to the big question: If "One Third" of all the Stars of El were cast down for rebellion, what about the other two thirds who were not. And if one third did not keep their "First Estate", what about the other two thirds that did? And do we find in the mention of those "who kept not their First Estate", a suggestion that for those who did, there would be a "Second Estate"? And if there is a Second Estate, where and what might it consist of, if not a Mortal Probation here on Earth?

Surprising though it may be, this very question is addressed by God the Father in the 82nd Psalm. Therein we read of a meeting, which was held in Primordial Times, wherein El Elyon stood before the Divine assembly of His Children and addressed them: "I have said ye are gods" He declared to them, "and all of you are children of Elyon: But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes."[122] To be sure, El's children are born Divine, but this is

---

*The Interpreter's Bible* states the following: "Magi" . . . denotes astrologers and magicians generally. The New Testament and the rabbis usually employ it in an evil sense ("magicians"), but Matthew probably thinks of Babylonian astrologers.

Magi believed that a **star** could be the fravashi (counterpart or angel) of a great man. ***Jews often identified the star out of Jacob*** (Num 24:17) ***with the Messiah***. Closer parallels are found in pagan antiquity and in the late Jewish stories that stars announced the births of Isaac and Moses. (*The Interpreter's Bible* 7:257)

[115]Matt 2:1–16; Rev 22:16; *The Jewish Encyclopedia* 10:184

[116]Luke 2:13–24

[117]Psa 78:49; Judges 9:23; 1 Sam 16:14–23; 18:10; 19:9; Luke 7:21; 8:2; Acts 19:12–16

[118]Isa 14:12–14

[119]Rev 12:4

[120]2 Peter 2:4

[121]Jude 6. Many antagonists to Mormonism such as Walter Martin have supposed that this doctrine originated with the Prophet Joseph Smith (see Moses 4:1–4; Abraham 3:23–28) — we see from these passages however that the same doctrine is also to be found in the Bible.

[122]Psa 82:1, 6

[123]Job 38:4, 7; Hebrews 5:8–9; Matt 10:24–25; Luke 6:40

not to say that they are born with a silver spoon in their mouth. In accordance with the Divine Decree, to the very last, every faithful child of El will successfully endure a "Mortal Probation" — and it is this "Probation" that will constitute their "Second Estate". In this, not even El's Firstborn Son would be excepted!

Not only will the children of El endure a Mortal Probation, but they will do it joyfully — the proof of which is found in the fact that: "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of El shouted for joy" when the "Foundations of the Earth were laid"! Indeed, in the beginning of time, the Father Himself led the way, by suffering the experience of the Fall — and by enduring the Servitude of Mortality for 930 years. In keeping with this, even though the Saviour was the Son of God, "yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered suffered", among which was the death of the cross! "And being made perfect, he became the author of Eternal Salvation unto *all them that obey him"* — and as he has so aptly expressed the thought: "The Disciple is not above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord", and "every one that is perfect shall be even as his Lord".[123]

The whole idea of a "First" and "Second Estate", together with the rebellion of Satan and his followers, is set forth in certain terms in two Revelations which were given to the Prophet Joseph Smith — the first in 1830, and the second in 1835. Consider the following:

And I, the Lord God, spake unto Moses, saying: That Satan, whom thou hast commanded in the name of mine Only Begotten, is the same which was from the beginning, and he came before me, saying — Behold, here

---

[124]Deut 32:8

[125]This is precisely what the Book of Mormon teaches. See Alma 13:3–5.

[126]Gen 1:26–28

[127]Gen 2:5

[128]Gen 2:7

[129]See "Biblical Cosmology", by Thomas W. Brookbank, published as a 3 part article, commencing in the April 1887 issue of *The Contributor*, Vol. 8:218–229. For another source, see *Journal of Discourses* Vol. 14:116.

am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost, and surely I will do it; wherefore give me thine honor. But, behold, my Beloved Son, which was my Beloved and Chosen from the beginning, said unto me — Father, thy will be done, and the glory be thine forever. Wherefore, because that Satan rebelled against me, and sought to destroy the agency of man, which I, the Lord God had given him, and also, that I should give unto him mine own power; by the power of mine Only Begotten, I caused that he should be cast down; And he became Satan, yea, even the devil, the father of all lies, to deceive and to blind men, and to lead them captive at his will, even as many as would not hearken unto my voice. (Moses 4:1–4)

Now the Lord had shown unto me, Abraham, the intelligences that were organized before the world was; and among all these there were many of the noble and great ones; And God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them, and he said: These I will make my rulers; for he stood among those that were spirits, and he saw that they were good; and he said unto me: Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born. And there stood one among them that was like unto God, and he said unto those who were with him: We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell; And we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them; And they who keep their first estate shall be added upon; and they who keep not their ***First Estate*** shall not have glory in the same kingdom with those who keep their ***First Estate***; and they who keep their ***Second Estate*** shall have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever. And the Lord said: Whom shall I send? And one answered like unto the Son of Man: Here am I, send me. And another answered and said: Here am I send me. And the Lord said: I will send the first. And the second was angry, and kept not his First Estate; and, at that day, many followed after him. (Abraham 3:22–28)

These passages both attest to the doctrine of the Pre-existence — a doctrine which is strongly suggested in the question which the Father put to Job. "Gird up now thy loins like a man" Yahweh "demanded", "and answer thou me":

---

*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* states the following:

Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare [unto Me the answer], if thou hast understanding. . . . [Where wast thou] *When the morning stars sang together*, and *all the sons of God* shouted for joy? (Job 38:3–7)

In this passage the Father indites Job for his murmuring, by forcefully reminding him of the fact, that the trial of his faith, which he was then undergoing, was of his own choosing in a pre-mortal life. The answer to the Query of the Father, is implied in the Question. Obviously Job was present when the Foundations of the Earth were laid, else why bother to ask?

This passage establishes the doctrine of the "Pre-existence". At the time of his "First Estate", Job had been among "the Sons of God that shouted for joy". The cause of their rejoicing was the opportunity for Personal Growth and Development, which had been offered them by their Father — namely, the experience of a Mortal Probation here on Earth.

That this is in keeping with context, is established by yet another declaration, which is made by God to Jeremiah when he was called into the LORD's service. As Yahweh then expressed himself:

Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. (Jeremiah 1:5)

To be sure, these words are not intended to convey the idea that God ordained Jeremiah to be a Prophet before he existed. Such a thought reduces the Unequivocal Communication of God into Meaningless Stupidity. The LORD here declares in the most certain terms that God knew Jeremiah before he was formed in the womb of his mother, and that in a Primordial Life, God had sanctified Jeremiah, and that God had ordained him to be a Prophet before he was born on earth.

We have already learned that both the New Testament and the Old Testament teach that Satan was cast down because of wickedness in a primordial Life. Could it be that the reason for the election of Jeremiah and the House of Israel in the Primordial Council[124] was for an opposite reason — namely because of their Righteous

Works or Worthy Life in a former Existence.[125] The fact that such thinking was prevalent in Biblical times is attested by the question which was put to Jesus in the Gospel of John:

> Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? (John 9:2)

The whole question presupposes the premortal existence of man, for how could the blind man sin before birth, if he did not exist? It was with this same belief in mind, that later the same day, the Pharasies condemned the Blind Man whom Jesus had healed, because he affirmed that Jesus was a Prophet. In response to his affirmation they rebuked him:

> Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out. (John 9:34)

This same idea is also set forth in the Apocrypha, where Solomon is represented as saying that he "was a boy of happy disposition":

> I had received a good soul as my lot, or rather, being good, I had entered an undefiled body. (Jerusalem Bible, Wisdom 8:19–20)

## TWO DIVERGENT ACCOUNTS OF CREATION IN GENESIS

For a long time scholars have acknowledged that there are two different accounts of the creation given in Genesis. The first is found in chapter one where the entire universe including all animal and plant life is spoke into existence. The crowning work of this creation is man, who on the sixth day is created in the "image" and "likeness" of God.[126] The second account of creation is found in chapter 2, and in every way it is different from the first. While chapter one tells of the creation of all animal and plant life on earth and finally ends with the creation of man. In contrast to this, chap-

---

"In Genesis there are two accounts of his [Adam's] creation — 1:26–31, attributed to a Priestly editor (P), and 2:5–7, attributed to the Yahwist (J); the stories of his Fall and subsequent history (Gen. 2:15–4:1 and 25) are all J material. According

ter two begins by denying the existence of plant, animal or human life on Earth. Indeed, "the Lord God had not yet caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not yet a man to till the ground".[127] In continuing it states that the Lord God caused a mist to rise up on the face of the earth, and it is not until then that the Lord finally creates man from the dust of the ground.[128] No mention is made of man's prior creation in the "image of God", but rather, after man's creation from dust, the Lord plants a Garden in Eden, and then the creation of animals from dust follows suit, in reverse order from that given in chapter 1.

For more than a century, Scholars have taken this discrepancy as an indication that originally there were two different creation traditions handed down, and rather than dispose of one in favor of the other, they were finally dovetailed together in Genesis.[129] However, in the last 40 years, scholars have come to understand that in New Testament exegesis, these two accounts of creation were interpreted as being a spiritual and physical creation, rather than two different accounts of the same event.[130] Nevertheless, they still maintain that this is merely a convenient usage of the New Testament writers, and that the Patriarchs in Genesis had no concept of spirit or spirit creation.

In view of what we have seen it becomes evident that these scholars are in error. Indeed the understanding of the New Testament writers was in every way consistent with that of the Patriarchs. The problem with the scholars is that they have failed to recognize the significance of the "Host of Heaven and Earth" which were created in chapter one, but not in chapter two.[131] The "Host" which were created in chapter one were divine beings created from Light, hence "Stars" or "Spirits",[132] but in chapter two, physical man was created from an altogether different substance, even the dust of the earth.[133] There was no mention of creation from dust in chapter, 1 and no

---

to the P account, Adam was created on the sixth day, after the animals (1:26); was made in the image and likeness of God (1:26 f.); commanded to multiply; and given dominion over the earth (1:28–30). The J account, more anthropomorphic, assigns his creation to the time when the earth was still void. It describes God's

creation of the "Host of Heaven and Earth" in chapter 2.

Bearing this in mind, the first five verses in chapter two take on special meaning. It commences by summarizing the creation as given in chapter 1: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished", it says, "and all the ***Host*** of them." In continuing it affirms again: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens," and then finally in verse 5 we are informed that the generations of the Heavens and the Earth constituted the creation of "every plant of the field *before it was in the earth,* and every herb of the field *before it grew*",[134] with the obvious inference that the same applies to man and beast. And if so, at the very least, it is certain that the creation of living things as given in Genesis chapter one, constituted the creation of things spiritual. In concluding this

breathing into Adam's nostrils the breath of life (2:7), the creation of Eve from Adam's rib (2:21 f.), and Adam's work in the garden of Eden, with its Tree of Knowledge and forbidden fruit (2:17)." (*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* 14)

[130]Thus in keeping with this doctrine, in the understanding of the New Testament writers, when Genesis chapter 1 verses 26 through 28 speaks of man being created in the image and likeness of God, it is speaking about the spiritual creation of Jesus who was the "express image" of the Father's person, and the brightness of his glory (Heb 1:3) and the "firstborn among many brethren". (Heb 1:6; Rom 8:29) It was in view of this doctrine that Jesus told his disciples that "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father". (John 14:9) Hence, in accordance with New Testament teachings, Jesus preexisted with the Father before the foundations of the Earth were laid. For more on this see: "The Father and the Son, the Two Gods of the Old Testament", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 12 <April 1995> No. 4).

[131]Gen 2:1

[132]*The Jewish Encyclopedia* 10:184

[133]Gen 2:7

[134]Gen 2:5

[135]This is precisely what the book of Hebrews proclaims to the world. Over and over again, it affirms that Jesus was *"a Priest after the order of Melchizedek",* and that he was the living fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy, as it is recorded in the above passage from Psalms. Consider for example the following:

And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but Yahweh

topic, the following contrast between Genesis chapter 2 verse 4 and a couplet from Ugarit is highly significant:

These are
the generations of the heavens
and of the Earth
(Gen. 2:4)

The Sons of El
the assemblage of the Stars
the generations of the heavens
(Oldenburg 18)

In view of the Great Mystery which these questions have been for the world wide community of brilliant and educated scholars, and this too, for the last several hundred years, it is most significant that an ignorant, unread, backwoods farm boy from up-state New York, should claim to have received a communion with God, at the early date of 1830, wherein this whole doctrine is clearly set forth by divine revelation from Heaven. Consider the following:

Thus the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. . . . And now, behold, I say unto you, that these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, when they were created, in the day that I, the Lord God, made the heaven and the earth; And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew. For I, the Lord God, created all things, of which I have spoken, spiritually, before they were naturally upon the face of the earth. For I, the Lord God, had not caused it to rain upon the face of the earth. And I, the Lord God,

---

that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. As Yahweh saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Yahweh that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience

had created all the children of men; and not yet a man to till the ground; for in heaven created I them; and there was not yet flesh upon the earth, neither in the water, neither in the air; (Moses 3:1, 4–5)

## JESUS AND EL
## THE NEW TESTAMENT CONNECTION

Surprising though it may be, the New Testament itself demonstrates a strong three-fold relationship between the ancient worship of El and the religion of Jesus — a relationship which can be recognized in New Testament Theology, Prophecy and linguistics. One of the most important of these connections is bound up in the story of Abraham when he met Melchizedek as he was returning from the slaughter of the Kings. What is significant is that Melchizedek is directly connected with "El" as His Priest, "The Priest of El Elyon". The great importance to be attached to this is the Messianic Psalm which prophetically foretold that the future Christ would be a Priest "After the order of Melchizedek":

Yahweh hath sworn, and will not change His mind, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. (Psa 110:4)

If this Passage means what it says, and says what it means, then it only follows that the Messiah would also be "The Priest of El Elyon" — or, as the translators would render it, "The Priest of the Most High God".[135] As fantastic as this may appear, yet we have only begun upon the road of discovery, for as we shall see, not only does the New Testament declare Jesus to be "The Priest of El Elyon", but it also affirms in certain terms that Jesus was His Son! This is born out by the story of Jesus when he encountered the man who was possessed by a legion of unclean spirits. He is immediately recognized by them and addressed as "Jesus thou Son of the Most High God".[136] In Luke's account of this story, Jesus is addressed more in accordance with the original Hebrew, that is, "El Most High" or "God Most High":

When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God Most High? (Luke 8:28)

Lockyer[137] in his book *All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible*,[138] affirms that "Although this is the first occurrence of the name [Most High God] in the New Testament, it was the divine name used in the earliest stage of the patriarchal worship of one Supreme Deity":

> For instance, Melchizedek is described as the priest of "the most high God" (Gen. 14:18) . . . . . applied to God, then, *Most High* is a superlative designation implying the *loftiest*" (*All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible* 248)

Perhaps the most significant New Testament reference to the title "Most High God" comes from the Gospel of Luke where the angel Gabriel appeared to Mary. After he had informed her that she would conceive and bear a son, she was instructed to name

---

by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; *Called of God an high priest* ***after the order of Melchisedec***. (Hebrews 5:4–10; **Note:** The divine name Yahweh has been inserted in the place of "he" and "him", in accordance with the original Hebrew passage from Psalms)

Again, chapters 6, 7, and 8 contain the following additional statements:

Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever ***after the order of Melchisedec***.

For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of El Elyon, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all (Gen 14:18–20); first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; [whose Eternal Priesthood is] without father, without mother, without descent [from one mortal man to another], having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man [Melchisedek] was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law [of Moses], that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But Melchizedek whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die receive tithes; but there he receiveth them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he

was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.

If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law [of Moses],) what further need was there that another priest should rise ***after the order of Melchisedec,*** and not be called after the order of Aaron? *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity* ***a change also of the law***. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that ***after the similitude of Melchisedec*** *there ariseth another priest,* Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment [as is the case in the law of Moses], but after the power of an endless life [as was Melchisedec]. For Yahweh testifieth, "Thou art a priest for ever ***after the order of Melchisedec****"*. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before [regarding certain things in the law of Moses] for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law [of Moses] made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God [through Jesus Christ, who was a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec]. And inasmuch as not without an oath Jesus was made priest: (For those priests [of the Levitical Order] were made [Priests] without an oath [from Yahweh]; but this [Jesus Christ was made a Priest] with an oath by him that said unto him, Yahweh sware and will not change His Mind, Thou art a priest for ever ***after the order of Melchisedec***:) By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man [Jesus], because he continueth [for] ever [in the resurrection], hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, *who is* ***holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,*** and made higher than the heavens; Who needeth not daily, as those high priests [of the Levitical order], to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law [of Moses] maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath [of Yahweh], which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, [even Jesus Christ] *who is set* ***on the right hand*** *of the throne of* ***the Majesty*** *in the heavens*; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, *which the Lord pitched,* ***and not man***. (Hebrews 6:20–8:2; some pronouns have been changed to personal nouns for the sake of emphasis and clarity)

[136]Mark 5:7

[137]"Dr. Herbert Lockyer was born in London in 1886 and held Pastorate in Scotland and England for 25 years, before coming to the United States in 1935.

"In 1937 he received a honorary Doctor of Divinity Degree from Northwestern

the child "Jesus". "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David."[139] Since Mary had not yet known man, she found this difficult to comprehend, and upon enquiring, the angel answered and said unto her:

> The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and *the power of the **Highest** shall overshadow thee:* therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee *shall be called the **Son of God***. (Luke 1:31–35)

In actuality, the designation "Highest" as rendered above, and the title "Most High" as given in Mark 5:7 and Luke 8:28 are all translated from the same Greek word "hupsistos". For some reason the translators were not consistent, however, in accordance with the original Greek, the above citation might just as well have been translated as "Son of the Most High".

The correlation between "El Elyon" as it appears in Genesis 14:18 in the original Hebrew, and the above quoted Greek passages from the New Testament are further strengthened by another related verse in Hebrews, chapter 7 verse 1. Here we find Melchizedek's

Evangelical Seminary.

"In 1955 he returned to England where he lived for many years. He then returned to the United States where he continued to devote time to the writing ministry until his death in November of 1984." (taken from the back dust jacket of his book, *All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible*.)

Lockyer was also author of numerous other books on the Bible.

[138]*All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible* was published in 1975 by Zondervan Publishing House, at Grand Rapids, Michigan. Zondervan is an inter-denominational Christian publishing house.

[139] It is significant that the giving of the throne and Kingdom is a theme or characteristic which is common to El as He is portrayed in ancient texts. For more on this see: "The Tale of Aqhat" published in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament,* (1969) third edition with supplement, by James B. Pritchard, pp. 149–155.

[140]*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2:414

[141]In giving its explanation of Genesis 1:26, which describes the creation of man in the "image" and "likeness" of God, *The Interpreter's Commentary of the Bible* states the following:

"Those religious conceptions which first come into sight at *primitive levels*

title "Priest of El Elyon" translated directly from the Hebrew into the Greek, thus providing us with the opportunity of determining how the authors of the New Testament equated the Greek language with Hebrew. In this case "Elyon" which translates into English as "Most High" is rendered in the Greek as "hupsistos". In like manner, the Septuagint, which is a third century B. C. Greek translation of the Old Testament, translates Genesis 14:18, together with other Old Testament references to Elyon just the same as the New Testament translators did, which as already stated, is "hupsistos". This precisely equates with Mark 5:7; Luke 1:31, 35 and 8:28 demonstrating in certain terms that Luke 1:32 designates Jesus as "The Son of the Most High". Again, bear in mind that the English "God" is a translation from the Greek "Theos" and that "Theos" is the translation for Hebrew "El". Remembering this it becomes self evident that Jesus' title "Son of God" (given in verse 35 as an alternate of "Son of the Most High" in verse 32) would, in keeping with the former title, as well as a literal translation, be properly rendered as "Son of El".

> The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the **Most High** shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of **El**. (Luke 1:35)

Lockyer informs us that in the New Testament there is an "absence of the variety and number of names of Deity [which are] so characteristic of the Old Testament". There are however two prominent terms which are used, that have a corresponding value to those in the Old Testament:

> [The] two prominent . . . [names] are God and Lord. The most frequently used is *God,* occurring over 1,000 times in the 27 books forming the New Testament, *and is the equivalent of* ***El*** (*All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible* 93)

---

may be the root of greater adult faith; and the greatness of developed faith must not be disparaged *because its origin was in crude ideas*. That is the double truth which emerges from this verse, and from the Exeg. on it. It is a truth which presents itself repeatedly in these first chapters of Genesis [Gen 1:26–28; 5:1–3; 9:6], and it is one that needs to be brought home often to our recognition — for we may not readily accept it. Our tendency may be to suppose that high beliefs

The Septuagint supports Lockyer's assertion. Of the some odd 238 times El occurs in the Old Testament, in those cases where it is translated into English as God, it is rendered as theos in the Greek.[140] In view of this, and remembering also that the New Testament setting is based on an Old Testament culture, we are safe in assuming that the many New Testament designations of Jesus as the Son of God constitute a direct affirmation that he was the Son of "El". This is completely consistent with the ancient concept of El, who was conceived not only as being the Father of man, but also as the Father of the Gods, among whom the New Testament proclaims Jesus to be numbered!

## THE BOOK OF DANIEL — THE ANCIENT OF DAYS — ONE LIKE THE SON OF MAN

No doubt, there will be those who argue that hard core anthropomorphism* had long since faded before the advent of New Testament Christianity, and that such "crude"[141] ideas as mentioned above were no longer in vogue. However the Book of Daniel will in itself serve as a formidable argument against this assertion. It was one of the last of the Old Testament books to be written, yet within its pages ancient polytheistic anthropomorphism, or shall we say theomorphism,[142] is there portrayed in all its pristine glory. Daniel speaks of God as a venerable old man — He is designated as the "Ancient of Days" who is enthroned in Glory with a million attendants, and besides these, one hundred million others, who stand before Him for judgment. In the midst of this congregation of Heavenly angels and Earthly Saints, the Son of God suddenly appears and is brought before the throne of God. He enters the scene as the gliorified "Son of Man", who comes forth riding upon

---

lose their dignity if their origins are humble." (*The Interpreter's Commentary of the Bible* 1:484)

"the clouds of Heaven". He is then brought before the "Ancient of Days" to be crowned as King of Kings and Lord of Lords (Rev 17:14; 19:16; 1 Tim 6:15), and is given "dominion, and glory, and a Kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him" (Dan 7:14). The whole scene is that of God the Father meeting God His Son:

> I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and ***the Ancient of days*** *did sit,* whose garment was white as snow, and *the hair of* ***his head*** *like the pure wool:* ***his throne*** was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. . . . . I saw in the night visions, and, behold, ***one like the Son of man*** *came with the clouds of heaven*, and came to ***the Ancient of days,*** and they brought him near before him. And there was given him [i.e. the Son of Man] dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: . . . . . *the* ***Ancient of days*** *came, and judgment was given to the saints of the* ***most High****;* and the time came that the saints possessed ***the kingdom***. . . . . And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of *the saints of the* ***most High***, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and

[142]This later term is really the proper word for our discussion, as the Bible does not actually portray God in human form, but rather it portrays man in Divine form. Indeed, the scriptures emphatically declare that "God created man in His own image" and "after His own likeness" which is to say, "like Father — like son". In other words, according to the Bible, God did not make Himself to be like us, but rather He made us to be like Him. Theomorphism then, is to ascribe to man Divine form, qualities, characteristics and personality — while "anthropomorphism" is to ascribe to God human qualities, characteristics and personality.

[143]*Adam Clarke's Commentary of the Bible*, Daniel 7:9. We will, of course, beg to differ with Clarke where it concerns this being "The only place in the sacred writings where God the Father is represented in human form". For more on this, see "The Father and the Son, the Two Gods of the Old Testament", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 12 <April 1995> No. 4).

[144]*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1907 edition, Vol. 1:463

[145]*Erdman's Commentary of the Bible*, p. 480

[146]*The Anchor Bible*, Daniel, Vol 23:217–218

[147]*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol 1:571–572

all dominions shall serve and obey him. (Daniel 7:9–10, 13–14, 18, 27; see also Daniel 2:44)

Nearly all biblical exegesis* equate the "Ancient of Days" with God the Father. Adam Clarke, who was a Methodist minister, and Hebrew Scholar wrote a commentary on the Bible in the late 1700s, which has since become a highly respected classic. Therein he states that the "*Ancient of Days"* is *"God Almighty,"* adding that "this is the only place in the sacred writings *where God the Father is represented in human form"*.[143] *The Catholic Encyclopedia* says that the Ancient of Days is "a name given to God by the Prophet Daniel," and then explains that, "It is from these descriptions of the Almighty that Christian art derived its general manner of representing the first person of the Holy Trinity."[144] *Erdman's Commentary of the Bible*, states that "the Ancient of Days" "is the description given by Daniel, who pictures God on His throne of judgment, judging the great world-empires." It then goes on to explain that the "Ancient of Days" "alternates with the title 'Most High' (verses 18, 22, 25, 27)".[145] *The Anchor Bible* states that "ancient Israel had long envisaged Yahweh as the divine judge enthroned in the assembly of his angels" and then speaking directly of the Ancient of Days, it goes on to say that even though "God" is not "explicitly mentioned by name," yet "every reader would at once recognize as God 'the Ancient One' who presides at this celestial tribunal." In continuing it says that "the term 'the Ancient One' as used of God, though not found in older biblical literature is partly based on ***the . . . popular notion of God as an old man***."[146] *The Jewish Encyclopedia* claims that the "Ancient of Days" is *"A poetical epithet* for God,"* and then states that the author of Daniel uses this title to describe "the venerable character of the being ***whose name*** *the author* ***hesitates to mention***."[147] *Zondervan's Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible,* observes that the "Ancient of Days" is

[148]*The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Vol 1:156

[149]*All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible* 74

a title intended to depict an old-man figure — 'Ancient' renders an adjective. . . . Hence the adjective, connected with the emphatic absolute plural of 'day,' *means advanced (with regard to) the days, that is, very aged."* It goes on to affirm that, "It is an *elegant Semitic expression to designate an old man",* and then adds that "Although the passage does not directly say so, the numerous commentators unite to take it at once to be *a euphemistic term for God*."[148] Herbert Lockyer, in his Book *All the Divine Names and Titles in the Bible*, wrote that: "The Hebrew word used here (i.e. Dan 7:9, 13, 22) for Ancient means *Advanced, that is, in age; hence old, aged*, and used in connection with God, it is not meant to suggest the existence of God from eternity. What was uppermost in Daniel's mind was *the venerable appearance of Old age*. Thus, *literally, the phrase 'Ancient of Days' implies 'a very aged man'* — The attribute of age pressing the majestic figure of the Judge. 'God . . . abideth of old' (Psalms 55:19)." Since Lockyer has difficulty conceiving of God in human form, he continues by quoting from another scholar who states that: "What Daniel sees is not the eternal God Himself, but *an aged man, in whose dignified and impressive form* ***God reveals Himself****."*[149] *Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* states that: "Since . . . honours were paid to old men . . . it was natural to conceive of God as the Supreme Old Man. Thus in Daniel God is called 'Ancient of Days' (7:9, 13, 22), and in the Enoch parables He is several times referred to as the 'Head of Days,' (Enoch 46:1; 47:3; 48:2), apparently because He was conceived as *a venerable Being with white hair* ***like an Old man****."*[150]

---

[150]*Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* Vol 9:479

[151]See D&C 27:11. The earliest publication of this revelation did not contain any reference to Adam being the Ancient of Days. It was amended to read as it presently does in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants.

[152]The Prophet makes a number of significant statements here. First he says that Adam "obtained" the "Priesthood", the "First Presidency" and "Keys" *"in the Creation, before the world was formed, as in Genesis 1:26, 27, 28"*. What is important to realize here is that as far as the creation of living things is concerned, the Prophet here identifies the first chapter of Genesis as the spirit creation, for he says that the creation of man as described in Genesis 1:26–28 was before the

As we have already seen, for the most part the Prophet Joseph Smith would agree with these scholars, especially with regard to the above title being reminiscent of "old age." This however, is not to say that the scholars would agree with the Prophet. Indeed, most would be unsettled if not shocked at the Prophet's revelation regarding the identity of this glorified being. Some time between 1830 and 1833, it was revealed that the *"Ancient of Days"* was a designation which properly belongs to the 930 year old patriarch of the human race — even ***Father Adam!***[151] The Prophet beautifully expressed his belief regarding this matter in a conference address which he delivered years later, in August of 1839:

> The Priesthood was first given to Adam; he obtained the First Presidency, and held the keys of it from generation to generation. He obtained it *in the Creation, before the world was formed, as in Genesis 1:26, 27, 28*. . . . He is Michael the Archangel, spoken of in the Scriptures. . . . .
>
> The Priesthood is an everlasting principle, and existed with God from eternity, and will to eternity, without beginning of days or end of years. The Keys have to be brought from Heaven whenever the Gospel is sent. When they are revealed from Heaven, *it is by Adam's authority*.
>
> Daniel in his seventh chapter speaks of the ***Ancient of Days****; he means* ***the oldest man****,* OUR FATHER ADAM, ***Michael****,* he will call his children together and hold a council with them to prepare them for the coming of the Son of Man. He (Adam) is the father of the human family, and ***presides over the spirits of all men****,* and all that have had the Keys must stand before him in this ***Grand Council***. This may take place before some of us leave this stage of action. *The* ***Son of Man*** *stands before him, and there is given him* [i.e. the Son of Man] *glory and dominion. Adam delivers up his stewardship to Christ,* that which was delivered to him as *holding the* ***Keys of the Universe****,* but retains his standing **AS HEAD OF THE HUMAN FAMILY**.[152] (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* 157; see also *The Words of Joseph Smith* <before 8th August 1839> 8–9)

---

world was, hence Adam obtained the "Priesthood", the "First Presidency" and the "Keys" at least as early as the time of the spirit creation (For more on this see Moses 3:4–5, 7; 6:36, 51; Ether 3:15–16; *The Words of Joseph Smith* <before 8th August 1839> 232, 341).

The scholars say that the Ancient of Days is God the Father — on the other hand the Prophet Joseph Smith has revealed that he is "aged" Adam. However, as we have already seen, if there should appear to be contradiction between the opinions of men and the revelations of God, in this case, there is a reconciliation. On April 9th, 1852, at a General Priesthood Conference, President Brigham Young made a proclamation to the world, wherein he revealed a secret doctrine which the Prophet Joseph Smith had taught years earlier in his private councils[153]:

> Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a *celestial body*, and brought Eve, *one of his wives*, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, *the Archangel*, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about whom holy men have written and spoken — He *is our* FATHER *and our* GOD, *and the only God with whom* WE *have to do*. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or nonprofessing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later. (*Journal of Discourses* 1:50–51, emphasis in original; see also *The Teachings of President Brigham Young* Vol 3: 92–93)

In this statement, President Young puts the whole picture in perspective. Not only was Adam "MICHAEL, *the Archangel"*, but he was also the "ANCIENT OF DAYS" and "God the Father" — in fact, "He *is our* FATHER *and our* GOD, *and the only God with whom* WE *have to do"!* So according to President Young, both the scholars and the Prophet are right — the Ancient of Days is God the Father — and just as President Young has told us: God the Father is the 930 year old Patriarch of the human race — *even* ***Father Adam***.

---

Later in the same discourse, the Prophet makes another statement regarding this doctrine:

> ***The Father*** called all spirits before him at the creation of Man & organized them. ***He (Adam)*** is the head, and was told to multiply. The Keys were given to him, and by him to others & he will have to give an account of his Stewardship, & they to him. . . . . ***He (Adam)*** is ***the Father*** of the human family & ***presides*** *over the* ***Spirits*** *of all men"* (*The Words of Joseph Smith* <before 8 August 1839> 9)

Not only does the Prophet state that Michael/Adam "presides over the spirits of all men", but in continuing, he teaches that he holds *"****the keys of the Universe****",*

All this fits in nicely with what we have learned about El. We have already seen that in ancient texts, He is referred to by such epithets as the "ancient one", and the "Eternal One" with "grey beard and concomitant wisdom." There were also other characterizations of "El", such as "Eternal Father" and "King, Father of Years" — He is even referred to as ***"Father Adam"***,[154] and all this cannot help but bring to mind Daniel's vision as cited above. *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* even goes so far as to state that Daniel's designation of God as the "Ancient of Days" "reads like a description of Grey haired El."[155]

The reference to "one like a Son of man" who is brought before "the Ancient of Days" is yet another important connection. In the

---

which geographically speaking, takes in a great deal more territory than just this Earth. Surely the Prophet is here describing the dominion of a God — and the fact that the God of whom he speaks is "the Father" is obvious from the context, for even though Michael/Adam delivers up his stewardship to Christ, still he "retains his standing as head of the Human Family". Indeed, it is clear that Adam is God the "Father", for it is directly stated in the text. But of all the Prophet's remarks, perhaps the most significant is his identification of Michael/Adam with the "Ancient of Days". As we have already seen, the significance here is found in the fact that the "Ancient of Days" is God the Father, and nearly all biblical exegesis directly states this to be the case.

[153]For more on this, see "The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine As Joseph Taught It", 3rd enlarged edition, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 5: <April 1988> 22–32

[154]The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* makes the following statement:

The King James Version of the Bible rendered both *attik yomin* in Daniel 7:9 and *attik yomayya* in verses 13 and 22 by the phrase "the Ancient of days," i.e., with the definite article *the* and the capital *A*. Hence with the clear implication that this was an appellation or epithet of God (like, for example, "the God of heaven" in Dan. 2:18, 19, etc.): just as it rendered *Kevar enash* in Daniel 7:13 by the phrase "one like the Son of man," likewise with a capital letter preceded by the definite article, with the clear implication that the reference was to "the Son of man" of the Gospels, i.e., Jesus. All revisions of the King James Version, however — the Revised Version, the American Standard Version, and the Revised Standard Version (see Bible Translations, English) — have recognized that this is precluded not only by the context but by the very grammar of biblical Aramaic, and have consequently rendered: *attik yomin* in Daniel 7:9 by "one that was ancient of days," *attik yomayya* in Daniel 7:13, 22 by "the ancient of days" but without a capital *a — the* in this

New Testament gospels, Jesus interprets this "Son of Man" figure as a reference to himself,[156] speaking of that time when he will come to receive the eschatological* Kingdom from the Father. Bearing this in mind, the whole scene of Daniel's vision only serves to further solidify the relationship between Jesus and El! To be sure, it is more than simple coincidence that El's ancient Title "the Most High" is to be found all of twelve times in the Book of Daniel.[157] Chapter 7 even employs it as an alternate for "the Ancient of Days".[158] Indeed even the very name reflects the precise image of "El Elyon" as portrayed in Ancient texts.

### — THE BOOK OF REVELATIONS —

No, hard core anthropomorphism did not end in Genesis. Nor do we see the last of it in Daniel, for Daniel has its parallels in the New Testament Book of Revelations, which is the last book in the Bible. The titles are changed, but the scene is basically the same. The Glorified Father God is represented sitting upon His throne, and the Son of El, who is designated as the sacrificial "Lamb", comes before the throne to take the book out of the right hand of God. Concourses of angels surround the throne, even "Ten thousand times

---

case meaning not "the well-known" but "the aforementioned" — and *kevar enash* in Daniel 7:13 by "one like unto a son of man" (with *a*, not *the*). For of course these expressions — exactly like "great beasts" in verse 3, "lion" and "eagle" in verse 4, "bear" in verse 5, etc. — do not purport to be designations of objective realities but only descriptions of figures seen in a dream. To be sure, the figures symbolize objective realities: and that *the reality that corresponds to the figure of one of* ***advanced age****, with* ***fleece-white hair*** *and* ***snow-white raiment****, who sits on a throne of fire, surrounded by millions of attendants, and determines the fates of kingdoms and nations* ***is God Himself****, is so obvious that,* unlike other features of the dream, it is not specifically interpreted in the second half of the chapter. One cannot, therefore, ask, "Why is God called the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7?" because He is not, but only, "Why is God represented in the vision of Daniel 7 by the figure of an ancient of days?" As for the explanation, no further explanation than His role there as the Lord of history is necessary, *but an additional factor has been suggested*. A vague recollection of a Canaanite tradition has been surmised on the basis of *one of the epithets of* ***El****,* the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, namely, *mlk ab sum*, which is commonly interpreted as "the King, Father of Years." . . . . .

Ten thousand and thousands of thousands", and finally:

a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and cried with a loud voice saying *Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne,* and unto the *Lamb* (Rev. 4:2, 4; 5:1, 5–7, 11–12; 7:9–11).

The similarities are striking to say the least. One verse is so close that it appears to have been lifted verbatim from Daniel.[159] Should it be proven that these are but separate accounts of the same futuristic event, then the Book of Revelations would identify "the Ancient of Days" as God the Father. Indeed there is good reason to suppose this to be the case, for Revelations directly quotes Daniel all of

---

another possible solution; that *snm* in this title is a doublet of *nsm* men, people," so that *ab snm* would be synonymous with El's other epithet *ab adm* "Father of Man[kind] <or literally translated, "**Father Adam**">. (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol 1:940–941 — material in angle brackets added by the author)

[155]*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume, page 257

[156]Matt 8:20; 24:30; 26:64; Mark 13:26; 14:62; Luke 21:27; Rev 1:7; 14:14; Matt 9:6; Luke 1:33; Rev 11:15

[157]Dan 3:26; 4:17, 24, 32, 34; 5:18, 21; 7:18, 22, 25, 25, 27. It is interesting that the book of Ezekiel mentions another prophet-like character named "Daniel", who predates the biblical character by the same name in the Book of Daniel (Ezekiel 14:14–20; 28:3). Many scholars think it probable that the "Daniel" mentioned in Ezekiel is to be identified with the king bearing the same name in "The Tale of Aqhat", fragments of which were discovered at Ugarit *(The Anchor Bible, Daniel,* Vol. 23:7. For a published account of this tale, see *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament,* (1969) third edition with supplement, by James B. Pritchard, pp. 149–155). Not only this, but they also feel that enough parallels exist between the biblical book of Daniel and "The Tale of Aqhat" to establish a relationship between them. As the editors of "Daniel" in *The Anchor Bible* have expressed it:

Whatever the exact link between this idealized hero [in *The Tale of Aqhat*] and the protagonist of the Book of Daniel, there is sufficient reason to believe that the authors of the book [of Daniel] knew of such an ancient worthy and were familiar with certain stories in which he played a leading role. (*The Anchor Bible*, Daniel, Vol 23:8)

What is pertinent here, is the fact that El religion is central to both *The Tale of*

88 times.[160] On top of this, the Book of Revelations uses "Theos", which is the Greek equivalent of Hebrew "El", ninety one times by itself, and seven additional times in conjunction with "Pantokrator", which is the Greek equivalent of Hebrew "Shaddai", or English "Almighty". "Pantokrator" also occurs one additional time by itself and "Father" four times. While the use of "Theos" might be argued in different ways, the connection of "Theos" with "Pantokrator" for Hebrew "Shaddai", in conjunction with other usages which are common to the Book of Revelations and unique to the El Pantheon[161] — all this shows a strong El influence in the Book of Revelations. The fact that it quotes so often from the book of Daniel is another factor, for the El influence in the book of Daniel is well established.

---

*Aqhat* and the Book of Daniel. To begin with, the Hebrew meaning of the name Daniel is "my judge is El" (*The Anchor Bible*, Daniel, Vol. 23:7). This, coupled with Daniel's use of the divine name "El" four times, and "Elyon" all of twelve times, in conjunction with its use of "The Ancient of Days" as an alternate — all this, together with mention of "The Holy Ones" (Dan 4:13, 17, 23) of the divine assembly, and many other figures common to El religion, all argue hard for the idea that El religion was a prominent factor in the writing of The Book of Daniel.

[158]Dan 7:22, 9, 13–14, 25–27

[159]Compare Dan 7:10 to Rev 5:ll

[160]The commentary on Revelations in *The Anchor Bible* states that, "it has been computed that in the 404 verses of Revelation, 518 Old Testament citations and allusions are found, 88 of which are from Daniel and 278 from reminiscences of Scripture, especially (besides Daniel) Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Psalms, and Exodus. Revelation is, accordingly, a rereading of the Old Testament" (*The Anchor Bible*, Revelation, Vol. 38:37)

In his commentary on Revelations chapter 5, verses 1–14, the same author equates the "Throne Vision" and the "Lamb" with Daniel 7, where the Ancient of Days sits, and the Son of Man comes before the throne: "In chapter 4 [of Revelations] the prophet was influenced chiefly by his predecessor, Ezekiel. Here, however, the influence of Daniel and Enoch prevails, especially in the introduction of a secondary figure who is both "lion" and "lamb" who stands in a position analogous to that of one like a son of man. The Lamb is to the one seated on the throne as the one like a son of man is to the ancient of days in Daniel 7:13 and 1 Enoch, e.g.

## THE SON OF MAN PROBLEM

On June 8th, 1873, President Brigham Young remarked that it is "a mystery to the Christian world that Jesus is the Son of God, and still the Son of Man".[162] The mystery to which President Young referred has been a growing concern to "Christian" scholars for more than two hundred years. Ever since "Higher Criticism" was born, they have been mulling over the questions which are raised by the "Son of Man" sayings in "their" New Testament. The controversy has continued to grow till it has reached international proportions in the world arena of "Christian" scholarship. The whole controversy has a striking resemblance to Humpty Dumpty and all the Kings Men, who try as they might, could not piece the old egg back together again. In this case the problem is that the scholars don't know what the original egg looked like, so it is not hard to understand why they would have difficulty piecing it back together. One Christian scholar who dedicated his doctoral dissertation to this subject, has aptly summed up the Problem:

'EMBARRASSING' MIGHT BE the kindest word for it. The insistent problem of the meaning of the designation Son of Man has plagued and vexed New

---

48:2 (*The Anchor Bible*, Revelation, Vol. 38:88; see also *The Interpreter's Bible*, Revelation, Vol. 12:409; *Clarke's Commentary*, Revelation 5:11)

[161]As already stated, there are many elements in the Book of Revelations which come from the religion of El worship. Among these, perhaps the best known is the seven headed dragon "Leviathan" which is mentioned in Revelations 12:3–4 and who is there identified with Satan. The Greeks derived much of their religion and culture from the Pheonecian/Canaanite culture which preceded their own civilization, and in all probability, the mythological seven headed dragon "Hydra" who in Greek Mythology was killed by Hercules had its origins in Canaan. For more on this see *Ugarit and Minoan Crete* . . . (1966) by Cyrus Gordon, p. 75; also *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961) by Samuel Noah Kramer, pp. 201–202, 210.

[162]The *Deseret News*, Vol. 22 <June 18th, 1873> 308

[163]The following information is taken from the Fly cover: "*The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* [edited by Colin Brown] is, first, a basic translation, and then an extensive revision and considerable enlargement, of a German work entitled *Theologisches Begriffslexikon Zum Neuen Testament*.

Testament scholars ever since higher criticism began. One critic, who has devoted much time to the issue, is stating nothing but the obvious when he writes, *'The Son of Man Problem in the Gospels is* ***one of the most perplexing*** *and* ***challenging*** *in the whole field of Biblical theology.'*

Not, of course, that there has been any lack of interest or energy. Indeed, there has been so much written on the subject, so many diverse and conflicting points of view presented, that one senses a certain weariness with the whole matter. 'The Son of Man Again' is the title of a recent contribution, and an echo of that 'again' has probably resounded in a number of theological faculties. The pained ennui resulting from repeated attempts to force this seeming brick wall has led several scholars to *a counsel of despair* and many others to circumvent or avoid the problem in a manner which is *hardly faithful to the evidence of the Gospels*.

Yet the article quoted first above continues, 'It might well seem a fruitless task to continue trying to solve the insoluble, but . . .' The heart of the conundrum is summed up in that word 'but', for it is impossible to maintain that this is a peripheral matter. *The Son of Man problem cannot justifiably be set aside, because t****he Son of Man is at the very centre*** *of the Gospel record* and, as presented to us, is undeniably ***more essential*** *to Jesus' teaching about his own mission* ***than any other single factor***.

Past attempts to minimize this issue or to treat it as just another difficult problem need to be severely questioned. It ought even to be recognized that the many books which have dealt with the Son of Man as but one of the several 'names of Jesus' *are not presenting an adequate picture*. *The Gospels do not offer it to us as* ***one title among many****; they clearly state that* ***this is the designation*** *of which Jesus spoke,* ***and spoke consistently, as most revelatory of his work***.

---

On its first publication in German this was recognized as a major work of reference, and has since become more and more widely acclaimed as an important tool for understanding the theology and message of the Bible. Its translation and publication in this new English edition, together with the extensive revisions and extensive additions, have enlarged it so as to make it a unique source of information, invaluable to ministers, teachers, and anyone interested in the study as well as the teaching of the Bible.

"Professor F. F. Bruce, D. D., F.B.A., Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester, writes: "This Dictionary had already proved its worth in its original German form, and the present revised and enlarged English edition will make it a much appreciated companion to the New

These are strong words, but it is far from difficult to substantiate them. (*The Son of Man in Myth and History*, by Frederick Houk Borsch 15–16)

Borsch commences *his worthy dissertation* by confessing that "Embarrassing" would be the kindest word to describe the darkness and frustration in the minds of Christian scholars over the "Son of Man" issue. Of a truth, "embarrassing" is the "kindest" word for it — but if one were to prefer accuracy rather than "kindness", the more appropriate term would be "Apostasy". Indeed, by the confessions of their own scholars, it is obvious that the whole of modern "Christianity" has utterly lost the knowledge of "their" Redeemer — and this is to say nothing of their knowledge of his Father! Yet this notwithstanding, as scholars continue to jump off the sinking ship of false tradition, the conclusions to which some of them have come are nothing short of incredible!

*The New International Dictionary Of New Testament Theology*[163] has a lengthy article on the subject of the "Son of Man", wherein it reviews the theories, researches and progress which has been made by scholars in recent years. As with the above, it also acknowledges frustration, nevertheless, it broaches the subject with some pertinent and interesting possibilities. Indeed, as we shall see, some scholars have even gone so far as to suggest that the "Man" referred to in the "Son of Man" sayings might be "**Adam**" or even "**El**". Consider the following:

Attempts to shed light on the meaning of the Son of man concept by study of its origins have not so far produced any generally accepted conclusions. Three main contributions may be mentioned: (1) C. Colpe (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* Vol 8:406–430) surveys the possibilities of a background for Dan. 7 in the Old Testament itself and then in a series of non-biblical figures — **Gayomart**[164] in the Avestas,[165] **Adapa**[166] in Babylonian literature, the **sun god**[167] in Egyptian mythology,* **Adam**[168] in rabbinic speculation and the **primal man**[169] in gnosticism. Each of these possibilities is rejected, and Colpe himself suggests a background in Canaanite mythology, where the young god Baal[170] rides on the clouds and the supreme god, **El,** the **father of years**, is replaced as ruler by him.

Colpe admits that there are difficulties about regarding this myth as the basis of Dan. 7, but claims that it stands closest of all the claimants[171] to kinship with Dan. 7. (2) F. H. Borsch claims to have unearthed a widespread myth about ***the First Man, the king and Primordial Man***, which is reflected in various legends attested in ancient myth and ritual. (3) M. D. Hooker argues that the background of the concept is to be found in the Old Testament. The Son of man is to be understood collectively of Israel as the heir of Adam. Although destined to rule, the Son of man undergoes loss of dominion and suffering, but will finally be vindicated by God. (*The*

---

Testament for students, preachers and teachers throughout the English-speaking world. . . . .

"The international team of contributors is drawn from scholars and teachers working in universities, colleges and ministering situations on both sides of the Atlantic, who combine a wide variety of denominational affiliations with a common interest in the exposition and better understanding of the Biblical text.

"The Editor — In its English form *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* was edited by Colin Brown who read German for his B.A. degree at the Universities of Liverpool and Erlangen. He trained for the ministry of the Church of England at Tyndale Hall, Bristol. He holds the B.D. from the University of London and was awarded the degree of M.A. by the University of Nottingham for research on Karl Barth, and that of Ph.D. by the University of Bristol for research on Jesus in nineteenth-century theology. . . . Prior to joining the faculty of Trinity College, Bristol, where he now teaches, Dr. Brown was Vice-Principal of Tyndale Hall. He has been Visiting Professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois, and at Regent College, Vancouver, and has served as a Recognized Teacher in Theology in the University of Bristol."

This work is published by Zondervan Publishing House of the Zondervan Corporation, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506. Zondervan is an interdenominational Christian publishing house.

[164] ***Gayomart*** *was the* ***regal first man*** *of Iranian culture*. He was *'**the first of the human species**'* and was produced 'brilliant and white' and is presented "as though a kind of glorious shining ***sun-god figure***." (*The Son of Man in Myth and History* <1967> by Frederick Houk Borsch, 66–77; *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961) by Samuel Noah Kramer 342–344.

C. Colpe writes the following: "Iran. The apocalyptic Son of Man can hardly be the Avesta Gaya-martan or Middle Persian Gayomart in a Judaised form, for one cannot regard Son of Man and Gayomart ("mortal life," meant as an appellative and not as a term for anonymity) as variations of one and the same prototypical primal man. Such a figure with a protological as well as eschatological role can be proved between Zarathustra or the later Avesta on the one side and the 2nd cent.

*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* Vol 3:617)

Could it be that the obvious truth is beyond the comprehension of their uninspired minds? Indeed, in many respects the thinking of these brilliant scholars is on target — but notwithstanding their great effort, *their utter ignorance of the knowledge of God* so stifles their minds, that they remain unable to piece the puzzle together. This is true for the most obvious of all reasons. If they cannot first acknowledge that Jesus actually had a Father, and one too, in whose express image he was made (Heb 1:3), how can they ever start upon the road to discover who that Father might be, or how it would be proper to address Him as "Man". Of necessity, a person must first learn ***what*** *God is*, before he can be in a position to comprehend ***who*** *God is!*[172]

---

on the other neither directly nor with the help of deductions from the Zoroastrian or Zurvanitian Pahlavi lit. of the Sassanidian and early Islamic period. Even if he could, it would still be impossible to show why his original form **Adam** does not appear in the last time in Judaism and his eschatological form Saosyant does not appear in the first age in Zoroastrianism or Zurvanism." (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8:408)

[165]The "Avestas" or more commonly called "Zend-Avesta", constitute the sacred scriptures of the ancient religion of Persia or Iran, which is commonly known as Zoroastrianism. Zoroaster, who was its founding prophet, is thought to have lived between 569 and 492 B.C. The oldest and most important texts of the "Avestas" are the sixteen "Gathas" which are hymns or psalms that are traditionally thought to have been written by Zoroaster himself.

*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* states: "Avesta. The corpus of preachings of Zarathushtra [i.e. Zoroaster] and teachings of the Zoroastrian religion, written in a language known as Avestan, which, along with Old Persian, the language of the Achaemenian inscriptions, represents the most ancient known state of the Iranian language group." (*IDB* 1:321)

*The Jewish Encyclopedia* states: "The Avesta is the Zoroastrian Bible supplemented by the Pahlavi, or Middle Persian, writings, as the Hebrew Scriptures are by the Talmud.

"The Avesta has special claims upon the interest of Jewish scholars, there being certain points of similarity between the Avesta and the Old as well as the New Testament, points that are striking or close enough to call forth frequent comment. In the next place, the Avesta, as the sacred book of early Persia, must command attention because of the historical points of contact between the Jews and the Persians." (*JE* 2:348)

[166]**Adapa** has been considered by many as **the Babylonian Adam**. But in actuality, "There is no reference to a first man by name in the Akkadian texts. Adapa, who has often been compared with Adam because of the similarity in name, is the "son of Ea" and a wise king; but he is not said to be the first man. On the contrary, he is 'the typical man' *insofar as he loses immortality*." (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 1:77) *There are similarities between the Biblical Adam and Adapa,* but there are also great differences. As stated above, probably the most significant is *the phonetic affinity between the names*. *Adapa was created "as the model of men"*. He was given "wisdom [but] eternal life [Ea] . . . had not given him ".

When Adapa was fishing his boat was capsized by a sudden burst from the south wind. This angered Adapa, who in retaliation cursed the south wind and broke its wing. For this he incurred the wrath of the high god Anu and was called to heaven to answer for his bad conduct. But Adapa was advised by the God Ea how to soften Anu's heart — consequently Anu offered him the blessing of "the bread" and "water of [eternal] life". But because of bad advise from Ea, Adapa refused to eat or drink of it, *which brought death and sickness upon himself and all mankind*. (*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* [third edition 1969 with supplement] by James B. Pritchard, 101–103; see also *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (1961) by Samuel Noah Kramer, 125–126.

C. Colpe writes: "Babylonia. Only on the basis of the unlikely thesis that the Son of Man was originally a second Adam can one associate the Babyl. Adapa with the Son of Man. Adapa himself has no eschatological, judicial or redemptive function." (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8:409)

[167]C. Colpe writes: "Egypt. The hypothesis that the Ancient of Days who gives the Son of Man world dominion in Da. 7 and the throne of glory in Eth. Enoch. 62:5; 69:27–29 *is the same as the Egyptian world-ruler the sun-god,* ***the aged Atum*** *and that the successor of Atum, a beautiful youth who is the sun-god Re (or Horus?), is the Son of Man, is close to the Canaanite theory*. But there is a difference in that on the Egyptian theory one has to postulate a unity of essence (however modified) between the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days, since the "pattern" sets before us ***different stages of the Egyptian Sun-god****, Atum in the evening and Re in the morning or at midday*. Such a concept is remote from Da. 7. Furthermore the analogy applies only if Atum abdicates, but Re's abdication is attested as well." (*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8:409)

It is no coincidence that Hebrew "Adam" is phonetically similar to Egyptian "Atum" as both the Hebrew and Egyptian dialects belong to the family of Semitic languages. It is also most significant that the similarities between the two do not begin and end with the phonetics of their name. Had Colp a more complete

Remembering that in the Hebrew, the word for "Man" is "Adam", the meaning of the designation "Son of Man" becomes

---

understanding of "El" religion and the texts which designate the High God "El" as "Father Adam" and the "Father" of mortal "man", together with the means by which He accomplished this feat, no doubt he would have assessed things differently. It is this part of the story regarding El being the "Father" of mortal "man" that is lacking. Yet as we have already seen, it is known that just as is the case with Egyptian "Atum", so also with Hebrew "El" — indeed, both El and Atum made their descent to Earth, whereupon, each mysteriously became the Father of the human race. And in the case of El, the story goes on to explain that upon His descent to Earth He actually made His abode in Eden, the "Garden of God".

The fact that the Egyptian Sun-God went by different names at its different phases or cycles is interesting when correlated to the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith. In accordance with his revelations, the first man Adam had more than one name. According to the Endowment Ceremony, as revealed through him, Celestial "Michael" (the name given Adam in his preearth existence, "Michael" meaning: "Who is like God" or more accurately "Who is like El") created the Heavens and the Earth and all things which in them are, as in Genesis Chapter 1. Following this creative act, Michael makes his descent to the new made world, taking up his abode in "Eden" "the Garden of God", which He himself plants on the seventh day of rest (Ezekiel 28:13; Gen 2:2–3, 8; Mark 2:27). Through the "veil of forgetfulness", Michael looses the knowledge of His illustrious past and enters Eden in a state of innocence, as the Terrestrial man "Adam". At this juncture, His preearth existence as "Michael" is lost to him, and he becomes the first man on Earth. In this condition of innocence, he does not possess the knowledge of Good and Evil — consequently, he does not know Right from Wrong. But according to the Divine plan, this state of blissful ignorance was not intended to last. Indeed, through the wisdom of God, the "Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil" (Gen 2:17) along with its "Forbidden Fruit" and "Satan" were all placed in the midst of the Garden paradise. In the absence of the all knowing God, "Satan" takes upon himself the role of Tutor, Tempter and Babysitter, all wrapted into one, and all this too, for the express benefit of our first parents, who as of yet remain in a state of childlike innocence. Through the "subtlety" of Satan, Adam's wife Eve is "beguiled", and in the end both partake of the Forbidden Fruit, bringing death into the world and the mortal fall of all mankind. At the time of the fall, the fluid which circulated in their bodies was transformed into red mortal blood, which began to course through their veins as the action of life. As a consequence, all their children are also mortal, and through this foreordained plan, their worthy preexistent spirit children are allowed to enter a probationary state in mortality, which becomes their "Second Estate".

In keeping with this, in Egyptian religion, the High God Re who is symbolized

as the Sun God, is known in at least two different stages, and by two different names — the first being as the rising and noon day sun, in which he is known as Re and the second being as the setting sun, in which state he is known as Atum Re or simply Atum. The setting sun turns red, as in the color of blood, and sets on the Horizon of Earth, symbolizing the fall of Atum Re and his descent to Earth as the first man. For more on the relationship between Hebrew "Adam" and Egyptian "Atum" see Hugh Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri an Egyptian Endowment* <1975> 131–136.

In the case of El religion, the High God "El Elyon", creates the heavens and the earth (*New Jerusalem Bible*, Gen 14:22), and then descends to Earth in Eden "the Garden of God" (Ezekiel 28:13), as Father Adam, the first man and patriarch of the human race.

It is obvious, that the High God Atum/Re maintained the same status and function in the Hierarchy of the Egyptian pantheon, that the High God "El"/"Father Adam"/"Father of man" did in early Hebrew and Canaanite religion. However, in view of the facts, it is self evident that the Early Christians had their own culture and traditions from the Patriarchs to fall back on, and therefore had no need to borrow the self same ideas and religion from their Egyptian neighbors — though it ought to be remembered that from the time of his infancy and for several years afterward, Jesus was raised in Egypt (Matt 2:13–15) and some of the Gnostic writings even go so far as to claim that Jesus was raised in the Temple of Osiris, who was a dying resurrection God in Egyptian religion (Alexandre Moret, *Kings and Gods of Egypt* <1912> 69–108) just as was Yahweh/Christ the Messiah in early Israelite and Christian religion. The big difference is that in the case of Christianity, Christ the Messiah actually came down on Earth as Yehoshuah ben David, and in doing so, not only did he fulfil Israelite prophecy, but the Egyptian Osiris legend as well. It ought to be remembered too, that the story of the Patriarchs, as recorded in Genesis, passed through a 400 year sojourn in Egypt, with all the House of Israel, from the time of Jacob to Moses, which lends credence to the idea of some Egyptian influence being exerted on the book of Genesis.

[168]See *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (1967) by *Frederick Borsch* 132–173. The following interesting statement is taken from the book *The White Goddess*, by Robert Graves:

"There is a record in the Talmud of a heretical sect of Jews, called Melchizedekians, who frequented Hebron to worship the body (consult the spirit?) of Adam which was buried in the cave of Machpelah. If these Melchizedekians worshipped Adam, the only other character in the Bible who had neither father nor mother, they were doubtless identifying Melchizedek's kingship with the Autochthonous Adam's. For Adam, 'the red man', seems to have been the original oracular hero of Machpelah; it is likely that Caleb consulted his shade [i.e. his spirit] not Abraham's, unless Adam and Abraham are titles of the same hero." (*The White Goddess, amended and Enlarged Edition*, by Robert Graves, published by the Noonday Press,

obvious. Jesus said it as clearly as his language could speak — he was declaring himself to be "the son of Adam". In a sheepish sort of way the above source tactfully admits this as a possible solution "We find ourselves on ***an unusual path***" it states, "if we trace Mark

---

Ferrar, Straus and Giroux New York, Copyright 1948, first American, amended and enlarged edition, 1966, twenty-eighth printing 1994, 161–162)

[169]See *The son of Man in Myth and History* (1967) by *Frederick Borsch* 55–75; see also *The Nag Hammadi Library Revised Edition* (1990) The definitive new translation of the Gnostic scriptures, complete in one volume, by James M. Robinson, General Editor.

[170]Canaanite Baal was a dying/resurrection god just as was the Egyptian God Osiris, and the Hebrew Yahweh/Messiah God of Israel — while "El" was the Father God in Canaan, both among the Hebrews and Canaanites, just as was the god Atum in Egypt.

It is important to remember that the Baal cult was not known in the land of Cannan during the time of the Patriarchs. The first Biblical reference to "Baal" is found in the 22nd chapter of Numbers (verse 41), where the Children of Israel first encountered it upon their return from Egyptian bondage. Yahwist Prophets were very zealous, and felt that Baal was an encroachment upon the land of Cannan, which was home turf for Yahweh. Indeed, Yahwist Prophets equated Baal with Satan, just as did Jesus in the Gospels. For more on this see: *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion* (1969) by Ulf Oldenburg.

[171]Colpe's conclusion that the New Testament "Son of Man" sayings are connected with El religion and the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7 is correct. However, in his observations, there is not a little that he has neglected to notice.

To begin with, Israelite Christianity was not dependant upon Canaanite El, for their "Son of Man"/"Adam"/"God" concept, as they had their own traditions which centered in the ancient religion of Israel and their own High God "El Elyon"/"El Shaddai", etc., whom they fully understood to be the God of the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Acts 3:13; Matt 22:32; Mark 12:26). Nor were they dependant upon Canaanite Baal worship (In New Testament religion, Baal is identified with Satan the usurper: Matt 10:25; 12:24, 27; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15, 18, 19; Isaiah 14:12–14; *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion* by ULF Oldenburg, pp. 101–181) for their knowledge and belief in a dying/resurrection/Son of Man/Messiah God — for their own Hebrew prophets had clearly foretold his coming thousands of years before Christ (John 8:56–58; Gen 49:10; see also "The Father and the Son, the Two Gods of the Old Testament", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 12 <April 1995> No. 4). Indeed, not only

2:27f. back to a Hebrew *ben*[173] *'adam* tradition":

For then this text is understood as a reference to the creation story: "The

---

did they foretell of his coming, but they also understood and clearly described the suffering/dying/resurrection nature of their Messiah/Son of Man God's mission (Psa 22; 69:1–21; 118:14–29; Isaiah 53:1–12).

Moreover Colpe does not seem to realize that ancient Christianity did not conceive of God in the abstract terms of modern "Christianity" and the Greek philosophers — but on the contrary, as is amply attested to in the New Testament record, their conception of God was Theomorphic, Anthropomorphic and polytheistic, and as they understood their religion, it was the God of the Patriarchs that they worshiped — even the very God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. If Colpe understands this, he fails to connect it in its natural relationship to the subject at issue in the Son of Man/Son of God question.

Colpe fails to realize that Christianity represented more than a mere resurgence in the use of the Divine name "El" (Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* states that: "Late in Israel's history, for example in the sectarian literature of Qumran, there is a revival of the formation of epithets after the ancient pattern of El plus a substantive, adjective or verbal adjective." *TDOT* 1:257). Indeed, Christianity was a restoration of the ancient El religion itself, just as it existed with the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob — the difference being that rather than Abraham's only son Isaac, or a sacrificial ram being offered up — in this case it was the prophetically foretold Christ, the Divine Son of El, the Messiah God, that became the sacrificial "Lamb" (1 Peter 1:19; John 1:29, 36; Rev 5:12; 7:14; 12:11–12). The gospels of Mark and Luke both proclaim Jesus to be the Divine Son of El in the flesh (Luke 1:30–35; 8:28; Mark 5:7) — and not only His Son, but also His Priest — even "a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Psa 110:4; Heb 7:17, 21) — and being the Priest of El Elyon, Christ the Messiah restored the self same religion that belonged to his Priesthood: "For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law" (Heb 7:12). So instead of looking into the religion and culture of surrounding countries, such as Iran, Egypt, Babylon, and Canaan (all of whom for obvious reasons have similar traditions) scholars ought to take an honest look at the authentic Christian religion as it is presented between the two lids of "their" own New and Old Testament.

[172]Luke 10:22; Matt 11:27. That the world of mankind is clad in mystery where it concerns the nature of God is witnessed by the confusion in the religious world respecting Him. And *having utterly lost the knowledge of their Creator, they have also lost sight of their* ***Origins,*** and with it *the essence of their own being*. After all, how can they comprehend the essence of their being, if they do not understand the natural relationship which they sustain to their Creator. Indeed, if they knew their *Father*, they would then be in a position to comprehend their own inherent destiny as a *"Child of God"*, who in every sense of the word, was born to be like

sabbath was made for Adam and not Adam for the sabbath, hence the Son of Adam *[ben 'adam]* is Lord even over the sabbath. (*NIDNTT* Vol. 3:623, brackets in original text; see also *The Son of Man in Myth and History*, by Frederick Houk Borsch 323)

This passage identifies Adam as the Father of Jesus. The logic behind Jesus' reasoning is founded in the idea that in the beginning the Sabbath was made for his Father, who is identified in the text as Adam. And inasmuch as Jesus is the "Son of Adam", and His birthright heir — for this reason Jesus is "Lord even over the Sabbath".

It is significant that Jesus would say the Sabbath was made for Adam, as the creation story in Genesis emphatically states that God made the Sabbath as a resting day for Himself:

> And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. (Gen. 2:2–3)

According to the creation story the Sabbath was made for "God" — but according to Jesus the Sabbath was made for "Adam". Is it

---

their Divine Parents.

The Prophet Joseph Smith fully recognized the problems associated with this controversy and addressed them in his General Conference address on April 7th, 1844. The following were his remarks on this occasion:

> THE CHARACTER OF GOD
> — TO KNOW GOD IS TO KNOW ONES SELF —
>
> {In the} first place I wish to go back to the beginning — *to the morn of creation — there {is} the starting point*. In order to understand {and be} fully acquainted with {the} purposes [of God], it is necessary [for us] to know the mind, decrees and ordination of ***the Great Eloheim*** {who} sits [enthroned] in {yonder} heavens {as he did at the creation of the world. It is necessary} for us to take up [the subject] beginning at the creation; and it is necessary for us to have an understanding of God Himself in the beginning. *If we start right it is very easy for us to go right* ***all the time***, but ***if we start wrong*** it is {a} hard matter to get ***right***.
>
> There are but very few beings in the world who understand rightly the Character of God, and *if men do not comprehend the character of God, they do not comprehend*

*themselves*. They do not comprehend anything that is past or that which is to come {as it respects their relationship to God}. [They] do not comprehend their own character. They cannot comprehend the beginning, nor the end. They do not know, *neither [do they] understand their own relationship to God*, and {consequently} the world comprehends but little more than the brute beast.

— UNINSPIRED MAN — IGNORANT AS THE BEAST —

If a man learns [as he goes through life, and yet in the end he] know[s] nothing more than to eat, drink, sleep [and] arise; and [he] does not comprehend any more [than this about the purpose of his own existence, or] the designs of God, [the Great] Jehovah [in the creation of man upon Earth — if] this is all man knows [about himself], what better [is he] than the beast! The Beast comprehends the same thing. [It] eats, drinks, [and] sleeps and comprehends the present and [naturally] knows as much [about God and the purpose of its existence] as we [do. Natural man] knows nothing more about God or his [own] existence [than the beast] and *unless we are able to com[municate with God we must remain in darkness]*.

And how are we [to obtain communion with God? We are] to do it by no other way than [revelation, through] the [pure] inspiration of Almighty God. [And this is the desire of my heart, to communicate to you some of the revelations which God has given to me.] I want to go back to the beginning, that you may understand, and so lift your minds into a more lofty sphere {and} a more exalted [under]standing than what the human mind is generally [in] want [to] understand.

— AND THIS IS ETERNAL LIFE TO KNOW GOD —

I want to ask this congregation [a question. And I want] every man, woman and child to answer the question [for themselves] in their own heart: *What kind of a being is God?* Ask yourselves — turn your thoughts in[to] your [own] hearts and [answer if you can]. I again repeat the question: What kind of a being is God? [Is there] any man or woman [here] that know[s Him?] Have any of you seen Him, heard Him, or communed with Him? Here is the question that will peradventure (from this time forth) occupy your attention while you live. The scriptures inform us that the Apostle says [that Jesus said] *"This is Eternal Life* ***to know the only wise God*** *and Jesus Christ whom he has sent."*

[To know God] — that is Eternal Life, [and] if any man enquires, "What kind of a being is God" — [and he] casts his mind to know [and finds that he] does not know God — [if he were to inquire of me], I would say, "If you do not know God, you have not Eternal Life! If the declaration of the Apostle be true — if he will search diligently his own heart, he will realize that unless he knows God, he has not eternal life. [Now let it be remembered from this time henceforth and forever, that a man] must know the only living and true God and Jesus Christ [whom he has sent in order] to have Eternal Life, {for} there can be Eternal Life [up]on no other principle!

— TEN THOUSAND WAGGING TONGUES —

My first object [then, in pursuit of Eternal Life] is to go back [to the beginning of creation] and find out the character of the only wise and true God {and what kind of a being He is}. And if I am so fortunate as to be the man to comprehend the [character of] God — and [I fully] explain the [matter and] show you what kind of a being God is — and I communicate [this knowledge to you] so that the spirit seals it upon your hearts, then let every man and woman [from] henceforth [and forever], put their hand on [their] mouth [and] shut [it, and] sit in silence, and never lift up [your] hand [nor] your voice — never say anything against the man of God, [nor any of his] servants again. But if I fail [or] if I do not do it, it becomes my duty to renounce any further pretensions to revelation [and] inspiration, or [any claim that I am] a Prophet [of God]. And if I should do so, I would [then] be like the rest of the world. ("The King Follet Sermon — A New Amalgamated Text and Doctrinal Commentary", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol 11: <April 1994> No. 4)

In view of the Prophet's remarks, the following makes for a most interesting confession coming from the pen of Doctor G. C. Berkouwer. Berkouwer is professor of Systematic Theology, at Free University of Amsterdam, and the following remarks are taken from the preface of his book: "*Studies In Dogmatics — Man: The Image of God":*

Today, more than at any time, the question "What is man?" is at the center of theological and philosophical concern. The number of studies that have taken this problem as their theme is almost innumerable. And yet, the fact this problem has forced itself to the attention of contemporary thought does not take away a rather puzzling aspect of the problem itself; namely, Why should this be a *problem*? . . . . . .

There can be only one answer to such questions; namely, that this almost irresistible problem appears to many a mind *not* to have found a clear and obviously irrefutable answer, and that this apparently general "knowledge" of the nature of man is not so obvious after all. Its obviousness is indeed drastically relativized as soon as we discover that man's reflection on the nature of man has produced an astonishing variety of views. Hence it does not appear, on second thought, to be at all clear and obvious *who* and *what* man *really* is, and there is thus every reason to pose the problem.

Indeed, there is scarcely another theme dealt with by human consciousness which has aroused so much controversy as this theme — the nature of man, which is the subject of this book. *There is, nevertheless, a generally dominant feeling or intuition that man, in one way or another, occupies a central position in the whole of reality;* although there are great differences of opinion as to the nature of this central position, and although there are some views of man which tend to play down the uniqueness of this nature. . . . . .

We need only read a contemporary symposium on the problem to be struck by the far-reaching differences in outlook. In the Netherlands, for example, the

possible that the contradiction between Jesus' saying in Mark and Genesis is more apparent than real — that in accordance with Jesus' understanding, Adam and God were to be identified as the same individual in two different states of existence?[174] Certainly this would explain the above passage in Mark. If this were so, then Biblical Adam would be the God El, just as it is stated in the Ugaritic texts[175] — consequently El/Ab Adam would be the God who rested on the Sabbath day of creation. In keeping with Genesis, this same El/Ab Adam would have spent this day of rest in a state of innocence, as the Terrestrial man Adam, in what Ezekiel declared to be "Eden the

recent *Gesprekken op Drakenburgh* (edited by J. Peters) might be cited. It includes a chapter on man as "the witness of the mystery of being." We might indeed be inclined to raise the question whether perhaps man is a mystery to himself, and whether desperate confusion of views regarding the "nature of man" might not be due to man's groping after something which is hidden, which is an unknowable mystery, a hopeless riddle. Does what Paul says about the heathen and their search for God (Acts 17:27) — "that they might feel after him and find him" — apply also to our search for man? *Or is the confusion and hesitation, the doubt and uncertainty, only* ***the self-alienation of man****, who has* ***lost a true understanding of himself*** and others? (*Studies In Dogmatics — Man: The Image of God*, by Doctor G. C. Berkouwer, Translated by Dirk W. Jellema from the Dutch edition, pp. 9, 11, Sixth printing, October 1978)

[173]"Ben" is the Hebrew word for "Son".

[174] This is precisely in accordance with the traditional doctrine of Christ. In his preearth life Christ was the "Firstborn", who sat at the right hand of the Father, and by whom God created the worlds (Heb 1:2). Yet notwithstanding his former glory, upon his descent to Earth, he became a mortal man who was born of a mortal woman, as an innocent babe in a manger — and in this mortal state, finally he was humbled and made subject to the death of the cross. This is in amazing contrast to the former glory which he enjoyed with God the Father before the world was (John 1:1–14). And just so it is with Adam. In his preearth life Adam was Michael, the glorified Father God and creator of Heaven and Earth. But upon His descent to the new made world, He was shorn of His glory. As with the Son, so also with the Father — his memory was veiled so that he could not remember his illustrious past, and in this state, he was left in the Garden in a state of child like innocence, even as a man who did not know Good from Evil or Right from Wrong. Finally he was cast out of the Garden into the lone and dreary world, where he was consigned to a 930 year life of drudgery as a mortal man, who must earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, and who in the end must suffer mortal death — "for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." So then, *both the Father and the Son came from glory* — and each in their own turn and time, came down

Garden of God".[176] This period of rest would have been just prior to the time that "El/Ab Adam" fulfilled His purpose in the creation of Earth, when through the "Fall", He and His wife Eve would sire and give "mortal birth" to their numerous spirit offspring, whom the creation story identifies as the Host of Heaven and Earth.

That this whole idea is in accordance with the religion of Jesus, is testified to in yet another New Testament passage, which again identifies El/Ab/Adam as the Father of Christ. Remembering that the Gospels of Mark and Luke both proclaim the Father of Jesus to be El Elyon, and remembering also that Mark 2 and 27, along with many other passages, state that Jesus is "the son of Adam" — in view of this, consider the following:

For this cause I bow my knees unto *the* ***Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom*** *[or after whom]* ***the whole family*** *[of man, both]* ***in heaven and*** *[on]* ***earth is named*** (Ephesians 3:14–15)[177]

What this passage states is that the whole human family is named after the Father of Jesus — but which of the Father's many names is it that the family of God is named after? The scriptures would inform us that it is the same name by which Jesus commonly referred to his Father. Jesus declared himself to be the Son of "Man", which is to say that "Man" was his Father.[178] In like manner, the

---

on Earth where they lived a humble existence which ultimately ended in suffering and pain and mortal death.

[175] The translators have rendered it "Father [of] Man" but the original Ugaritic actually reads "Father Adam" — "Ugaritic calls man 'Adam,' exactly as in Hebrew." (*Ugarit and Minoan Crete* . . . . p. 102) — of course, even Adam is rightly called the "Father of man".

After the initial discovery of the Ras Shamra texts in 1929, and the deciphering of the language (the cracking of the language was accomplished by an amateur) the first inclination of scholars was to identify Adam with the High God "El". This was due to the many references to "El" as "Father Adam", the first man and the Eden like description of His abode. Consider for example the following:

"*Adam and Eve*. A certain amount of stir has been caused by the supposed mention in these texts of a person whose name is written *Adm*, whom some would suggest to be the celebrated Adam of the book of Genesis. The Ras Shamra documents even give his home: a beautiful garden in the East, which corresponds exactly with

scriptures refer to us as "man",[179] and so it is that we derive our name from the Father of Jesus. We are "man", or as it is expressed in other passages, "the children of man", or "the sons of man".[180] And at times in the Old Testament, the Lord has addressed us indi-

---

that in the Old Testament. The mention of the word *adm*, which should in fact be read *adam* is not disputed; but in the passage in question, *adam* is not a proper name, but a word used in a collective sense, and should therefore be translated as 'mankind' or 'humanity'. Moreover, the context is obscure, and there are many uncertainties in the translation. In waiting for the solution of these difficulties, we must guard against rashly involving this text in the controversy over the story of the Creation and its meaning." (*The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra — Ugarit*, by Claude F. A. Schaeffer <1939> 76–77)

The difficulty which the scholars have with the above texts is that they are blinded by their traditions. The real problem with accepting the man "Adam" in the Ugaritic texts (whose abode is described as "a beautiful Garden in the **East**" Gen 3:8) as a reference to Biblical "Adam" is the fact that in the text, this same "Adam" is also identified as the High God "El". In the above it is suggested that the reference to "Adam" should actually be understood as a reference to "man" collectively, as in "mankind". However, in keeping with this same logic, we would then be under the necessity of believing that the text spoke of the whole of mankind collectively living in this beautiful garden spot in the "East", which be it remembered is described as the abode of "Adam". Ultimately the scholars realized that this could not be the real meaning of the text. The clay tablet actually reads "Father Adam" and in the end, in order to resolve the dilemma, the scholars elected to translate it "Father [of] man" or "Father [of] man[kind]".

The following statement regarding Adam is taken from Erdman's *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament:*

"The Akkadian traditions about the origin of man are not entirely uniform. *The most widespread version says that man was created from* ***the blood of a slain god***. According to the Old Babylonian myth of Atrahasis, the blood of a god 'who has understanding' is mixed with clay. It is remarkable that there is hardly any reference elsewhere in Akkadian literature to this ***half-divine origin of man***. Other statements mention only the creation out of clay."

In continuing this same article on Adam states that:

"In the Ras Shamra texts, **El is 'b 'dm** [i.e. 'b=Father 'dm=Adam], **'the father of mankind.'** [Or, literally translated, "Father Adam"] (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* Vol. 1:76–77)

[176]Ezek 28:13

[177]The *Revised standard Version* and the *New American Standard Bible* translate this passage as follows:

For this reason I bow my knees before the Father, ***from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named*** (Ephesians 3:14–15)

vidually with the same name by which Jesus commonly referred to himself, namely "son of Man".[181] Hence, Jesus is called the "Son of Man", and so also are we, and he along with all the rest of the human family are "the children of Man" — and according to the Bible, all of us are procreated in the express image and likeness of the same Divine Father.[182] It is just as Jesus declared it to be after his Resurrection:

> Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my Father*, and *your Father*; and to ***my God***, and ***your God***. (John 20:17)

We must remember that the word "man" as it appears in the Bible, is an English translation of the original Hebrew "adam". In the English we would say that we are "man" or "mankind", but in the Hebrew we would simply say that we are "adam" and occasionally "enosh". So, in the Hebrew scriptures it reads that we are "adam" or "the children of Adam", or "the sons of Adam", or "the son of Adam". The New Testament Gospels were originally written in Aramaic[183] — finally they were translated into Greek, and from Greek into English. Nevertheless, the Hebrew language and culture constitute the fundamental foundation upon which the

---

*The New International Version* reads:

> For this reason I kneel before the Father, ***from whom his*** [i.e. the Father's] ***whole family in heaven and on earth*** [i.e. all the Father's children] ***derives its name*** (Ephesians 3:14–15)

[178]This is stated in certain terms in a revelation which was given to the Prophet Joseph Smith in 1830: "for, in the language of Adam, Man of Holiness is his name, and the name of his Only Begotten is the Son of Man, even Jesus Christ, a righteous Judge, who shall come in the meridian of time. (Moses 6:57)

Another passage reads: "Behold, I am God; Man of holiness is my name; Man of Counsel is my name; and Endless and Eternal is my name, also. (Moses 7:35)

[179]The first case of this is found in the Spirit Creation, as it is recorded in Genesis chapter 1 verses 26 and 27, where the spirits of all mankind were created in the image and likeness of God. This is the first mention of the word "Man" in the Bible, and it is here that God speaks of the human race, both male and female, as a collective whole, and declares them to be "Man". The original Hebrew actually reads "Adam" rather than "Man":

> And God said, Let us make **adam** in our image, after our likeness: and let **them**

New Testament is predicated, and in the Hebrew, the "Son of Man" sayings clearly proclaim Jesus to be the "Son of Adam". Hence as it is stated in Ephesians, the whole human family is named after the Father of Jesus — we all are named after our Divine Father Adam — and Adam is El, the God and Father of the human race — not only in the Spirit (Heb 12:9), but also in the Flesh. (*To be continued — for the sequels to this pamphlet see* "The Father and the Son — The Two Gods of the Old Testament" ***Doctrine of the Priesthood*** Vol. 12: <April 1995> No. 4, and "The Adam-God Doctrine as Taught in the Bible" ***Doctrine of the Priesthood*** Vol. 31 <February 2014> No. 2.)

---

have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created **adam** in his own image, in the image of God created he him; *male and female created he them*. And God blessed **them**, and God said unto **them**, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (Gen 1:26−28)

The same idea is again repeated in Genesis chapter 5, verses 1 through 3:

This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created adam, in the likeness of God made he him; Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and ***called their name adam****, in the day when they were created*. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth: And all the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were eight hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters: And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died. (Gen 5:1−5)

The same doctrine is again repeated in Genesis chapter 9:

Whoso sheddeth **adam**'s blood, by **adam** shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he **adam**. (Gen 9:6)

[180]The following are Biblical references to "sons of man" (i.e. sons of Adam) as applied to us Isa 52:14; Jer 32:19; Dan 10:16; Joel 1:12−120; Mich 5:7; Ps 31:19; 33:13; 57:4; 58:1; 145:12; Pro 8:31; Ecc 2:3; 2:8; 3:10; 3:18; 3:19; 8:11; 9:3. References to children of man (i.e. children of

Adam): Gen 11:5; 1 Sam 26:19; 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Kings 8:39; 2 Chr 6:30; Psa 11:4; 12:1; 14:2; 21:10; 36:7; 45:2; 53:2; 66:5; 90:3; 107:8, 15, 21, 31; 115:16; Pro 15:11; La 3:33; Eze 31:14; Dan 2:38. In the King James Version the translators elected to render the above passages in the plural as men rather than as it stands in the original Hebrew as "Adam".

[181]There are 106 "son of man" references in the Old Testament. Of these, two are in Job (25:6; 38:8) four are in Psalms (8:4; 80:17; 144:3; 146:3) two are in Isaiah (51:12; 56:2) and two in Daniel (7:13; 8:17) all of which are strong in "El" influence. Aside from these there are also four in Jeremiah (49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43) and ninety one are in Ezekiel, which also manifests considerable "El" influence (Ezekiel 2:1, 3, 6, 8; 3:1, 3, 4, 10, 17, 25; 4:1, 16; 5:1; 6:2; 7:2; 8:5, 5, 8, 12, 15; 11:2, 4, 15; 12:2, 9, 18, 22, 27; 13:2, 17; 14:3, 13; 15:2; 16:2; 17:2; 20:3, 4, 27, 46; 21:2, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 28; 22:2, 18, 24; 23:2, 36; 24:2, 16, 25; 25:2; 26:2; 27:2; 28:2, 12, 21; 29:2, 18; 30:2, 21; 31:2; 32:2, 18; 33:2, 7, 10, 12, 24, 30; 34:2; 35:2; 36:1, 17; 37:3, 9, 11, 16; 38:2, 14; 39:1, 17; 40:4; 43:7, 10, 18; 44:5; 47:6).

[182]Gen 1:26−28; 5:1−3; 9:6; 1 Corinthians 11:7; James 3:8−9; Heb 1:3.

[183]Aramaic was a sister language to Hebrew. In Aramaic, "Adam" is used as a proper noun for the first man, "Adam", while "enash" is the Aramaic equivallent of Hebrew "adam" or "enosh". Consequently, in an Aramaic translation of the early chapters of Genesis, "enash" is the equivilant of Hebrew "adam" and at times is used as an alternate for the proper noun "Adam". In keeping with this, in the Aramaic New Testament Gospels, Jesus is referred to as the "Son [of] Enash", just as he is referred to as the "Son [of] Man" in English.

In the Septuagint or Greek translation of the Old Testament, "Adam" is used as a proper noun for the first man "Adam", just as it is in Hebrew, English and Aramiac, while "anthropos" is the Greek equivallent of Hebrew "adam" and "enosh", Amaraic "enash", or English "man". At times, the Greek translation of Genesis also uses "anthropos" as an alternate for the proper noun "Adam". In keeping with this, in the Greek New Testament Gospels, Jesus is referred to as the "Son [of] Anthropos".

The following is taken from *Erdman's Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*:

"ᵉnosh

Contents: I. Distribution, Etymology. II. Meaning in the OT.

**I. Distribution, Etymology.** *'enosh* is widely attested along with *'adham* in the earliest representatives of the Semitic language group. Akk. *enesu* means "to be weak, feeble" (like the Biblical Heb. '*anash* I, 2 S. 12:15; cf. '*anush*, "incurable," which occurs 8 times in the OT) and in the 'iphtael it means "to be sociable." tenestu, "man, mankind," and nisu, "people, persons," belong to this root, but not issu, assatu, "woman." This word is common already in the earliest Aramaic. In Biblical Aramaic,

Aramaic, where *adham* does not occur, we encounter *'enash* 25 times. In the Ras Shamra material, *'ns* means "to be manly, brave" . . . . .

**II. Meaning in the OT.** *'enosh*, "man, men, mankind" (masc., never with the article), occurs 42 times in the OT, and Aram. 'enash 25 times. *'enosh* is found only once in the Pentateuch (Dt. 32:26), and it does not appear at all in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, or Kings. It occurs most frequently in Job (18 times), Psalms (13 times), and Isaiah (8 times, in late verses except for 8:1); it also appears in Jer. 20:10 and 2 ch. 14:10 (Eng. v. 11) (in the prayer of Asa). Thus, *'enosh* is found almost exclusively in poetic texts. . . . . But all this can be said of *'adham* or *ben 'adham*, "son of man," in the OT (__*'adham*), for several times *'enosh* stands in parallelism with (*ben-*, *bene-*) *'adham*, and is usually synonymous with it, as in two of the three parallel passages where we find "What is man . . . ?" (Ps. 8:5[4], *'enosh–ben 'adham*; 144:3, *'adham–ben 'enosh*; Job 7:17, *'enosh* without a parallel word); and also Isa. 13:12 (*'enosh*—*'adham*); 51:12 (". . . Who are you that you are afraid of *'enosh*, who dies, of *ben 'adham*, who is made like grass?"); 56:2 (*'enosh–ben 'adham*); Ps. 73:5 (*'enosh–'adham*) 90:3 ("Thou turnest 'enosh back to the dust, and sayest, 'Turn back, O *bene 'adham*!' "); Job 25:5f. ("Behold, even the moon is not bright and the stars are not clean in his sight; how much less *'enosh*, who is a maggot, and the *ben 'adham*, who is a worm!"); and 36:25 (*'adham–'enosh*). Also, *'enosh* appears in parallelism with "inhabitants of the earth" (Isa. 24:6), and with ___ *gebher*, "man" (Job 4:17; 10:5) . . . . .

In Biblical Hebrew, *'enosh* nowhere functions as an indefinite pronoun, as *'adham* does. However, in Biblical Aramaic it serves as an indefinite pronoun four times (Dnl. 3:10; 5:7; 6:13[12]; Ezr. 6:11, in every case *kol 'enash*, "every man" = "everyone"). . . . . .

The three remaining occurrences of *'enash* are found in Dnl. 7. The lion was made to stand upon two feet like a man (7:4); the little horn had eyes "like the eyes of a man" (7:8); and after the four beasts rose up out of the sea, the fourth beast was destroyed, and the power of the others was taken away, one "like a man" (*kebhar 'enash*) came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of Days (7:13). In this vision, the *bar 'enash*, lit. "son of man," is purely figurative; just as the four beasts represent the four preceding empires, so he represents the coming kingdom of the saints of the Most High (7:17f.). Nevertheless, the predominant interpretation at the present time is that the *bar 'enash* of Dnl. 7:13 is a product of the King-Messiah or Primal Man tradition. (See esp. A. Bentzen, *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, 19 (21952), 62−67, and the literature cited there; R. Marlow, "The Son of Man in Recent Journal Literature," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 28 (1966), 20−30; cf. further *ben* ___ *'adham*.) About fifty years after Daniel, in the symbolic words of Enoch, the Son of Man is an independent individual, a Messianic figure (1 En. 46:2; 48:2; 69:26−29; etc.). A symbolic figure is made independent in other literary contexts as well (e.g., *'anani*, "man of the clouds," also according to Dnl. 7:13; Midr. Tanchuma, Toledhoth 14, etc.). (*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 1: 345−348.)